

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Second Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre
Louis-Liard on Saturday, 24th July, 1948, at 0900 hours

*(Meeting held concurrently with the Tenth Meeting of the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature)*

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)
M. J. Aubert (Switzerland)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
M. Georges Deflandre (France)
Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud (France)
Mr. C. F. Dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Fischer-Piette (France) (*Secretary-General to the
Congress*)
M. H. Gisin (Switzerland)
Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Jeannel (France)
Dr. P. Jespersen (Denmark)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Dr. H. H. J. Nesbitt (Canada)
Mr. C. D. Radford (United Kingdom)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)
M. J. Segal (U.S.S.R.)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to
the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer to the International
Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

**Nomenclature of
suprageneric
groups below
family level**

1. PROFESSOR R. JEANNEL (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Sur la nomenclature des groupements supragénériques"⁵. After pointing out that zoologists were agreed that the authors of systems of classification were free to coin words to denote the great systematic categories from the Class downwards as far as the Sub-Order, Professor Jeannel observed that the position was quite different in the case of the names of families, sub-families and tribes. For these categories the *Règles* provided that the Law of Priority applied to the earliest proposed of the suprageneric units, provided that the name was formed from the stem of the name of a genus contained in the group and that the generic name in question was itself an available name and that there was added to the stem a particular Latin termination. The terminations in question were "-idae" for the names of families, "-inae" for the names of sub-families, "-ini" for the names of tribes. Professor Jeannel then raised two questions in regard to the nomenclature of this class of category.

Under the first of these heads, Professor Jeannel observed that it was absurd to use the termination "-inae" to denote a sub-family and the termination "-ini" to denote a tribe, for the first of these words was no more than the feminine of the second. The present method of denoting sub-families by the use of a feminine termination led to barbarisms resulting from the fact that it was customary in everyday speech to treat them as though they were of the masculine gender. He suggested, therefore, that a new termination should be adopted to denote the category of sub-family and that that termination should be such that the word so formed would be of the masculine gender. He accordingly proposed the adoption of the termination "-itae".

Passing to the second of the questions which he wished to raise, Professor Jeannel said that it was not possible to formulate for the selection of the names of families, sub-families and tribes rigid rules strictly based upon priority. It was, in his view, necessary to take account of two factors: (1) priority; (2) legitimacy. The first of these principles was recognised in the existing provisions of the *Règles*—to which he had already referred. He could not accept the proposition advanced by Bradley in 1928 that, as a condition precedent to the acceptance of a name proposed for one of these categories, that name must have been published in the form of a Latin plural, for such a stipulation would rule out most unfairly the work of the great masters of the early XIXth century, to whom entomologists owed the foundations of the systematics of insects. When

⁵ For the text of Professor Jeannel's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 164-165.

he had referred to the principle of legitimacy he had had in mind such cases as those where a tribe was established for the reception of some aberrant genus (as Schaum in 1870 had established the tribe *Mormolycini* for the species *Mormolyce phylloides*), and it was later found that the species so separated should in fact be referred to a well-defined family of later date (as, in the example cited above, had happened when it was found by Chaudoir that the genus *Mormolyce* should be referred to the family containing the Thyreopterids. In such a case it would be an illegitimate use of priority to apply the name *Mormolycidae* (based upon the tribe name *Mormolycini* originally proposed by Schaum) to the whole family as defined later by Chaudoir. A provision should, he suggested, be inserted in the *Règles* to deal with this class of case. He agreed that any provision recognising the principle of legitimacy would inevitably contain a subjective element. He considered, however, that this was a case where a certain discretion should be allowed to the authors of monographs. After a time the customary usage so established would acquire the force of law.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the paper presented by Professor Jeannel was very opportune, for the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had decided at a meeting held the previous day that the existing provisions (Articles 4 and 5) in the *Règles* in regard to the names of families and sub-families were totally inadequate and that the position in this part of the field of nomenclature would not be satisfactory until a comprehensive and logical plan covering all aspects of the problem had been worked out and embodied in the *Règles*. The Commission had accordingly invited the Secretary to the Commission to make a thorough study of this problem, in consultation with interested specialists, and to submit a report thereon for their consideration at the meeting to be held during the next (Fourteenth) meeting of the International Congress of Zoology. The paper just communicated by Professor Jeannel would form a valuable part of the dossier in this case. He thanked Professor Jeannel for the interesting and valuable contribution which he had made to this subject.

**Nomenclature of
Families and
Sub-families**

2. PROFESSOR ROBERT L. USINGER (U.S.A.) referred to the paper by Professor E. G. Linsley and himself entitled "The use of new names for preoccupied names in zoological nomenclature", of his wish to present which to the Section he had given notice prior to the opening of the present Congress. In that paper he and Professor Linsley

had raised a number of questions relating to the formation of the names of families and sub-families. As an Alternate Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, he had since taken part in the decision to invite the Secretary to the Commission to carry out the study to which the President had just referred. In the circumstances, he considered that it would be sufficient if the communication by Professor Linsley and himself were embodied in the material to be studied in connection with the proposed review of the problem of family names, and he had handed a copy of their paper to the Secretary to the Commission for this purpose. He did not therefore now desire to communicate the paper to the Section.

**Proposed
recognition of the
concepts "grade"
and "pseudo-
genus"**

3. M. GEORGES DEFLANDRE (FRANCE) presented a communication entitled "Les notions de grade et de pseudo-genre."⁶ M. Deflandre said that in a recent paper (1941) on the concept of genus as applied to the Silicoflagellids, he had adopted, when dealing with *Naviculopsis Frenguelli*, the expression "grade" in the sense in which that expression had been used by Cuénot (1936) when he wrote: "le pseudo-genre étant polygénétique doit donc être considéré non comme un genre, mais comme un 'grade' (mot de Bather, 1927)". In fact, however, the meaning attached to this expression by Cuénot was not identical with that adopted by Bather. Cuénot had given the following definition: "*Grade* (Bather, 1927). Certainne forme d'organisation qui peut apparaître séparément dans plusieurs lignées parallèles; c'est un pseudo-genre." Bather had referred to grades as "evolutionary stages, separated by horizontal lines indicating time-limits and denoted by an epithet or phrase not interfering with the systematic hierarchy". Later in the same paper Bather had observed that "more genera represent grades of organisation rather than lines of descent". In his (M. Deflandre's) view, it was desirable that the expression "grade" should be restricted to the meaning originally bestowed upon it by Bather. Nevertheless, the definition given by Cuénot corresponded to a precise conception, which was applicable to a number of cases. The concept defined by Cuénot should be rendered concrete by the adoption for it of a special term. Rather than coin a new name for this purpose he (M. Deflandre) proposed that there should be given to the expression "pseudo-genus" (pseudo-genre) a restricted sense corresponding to the definition given by Cuénot.

M. ANDRÉ CHAVAN (FRANCE) said that he thought that many of the apparent "polyphyletic genera" would

⁶ For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 166.

sooner or later be recognised as consisting of a number of true monophyletic genera, to which the ordinary system of nomenclature could be applied. For this reason he thought it would be preferable to wait until our knowledge was sufficiently advanced to subdivide the "pseudo-genera" into their constituent monophyletic parts, to which the normal nomenclature could be applied, rather than to apply a special nomenclature to the "pseudo-genera". In any case the problem called for the most careful consideration, and if it were ultimately found necessary to introduce the concept of a "pseudo-genus" it would be desirable that the Commission should give a precise ruling as to its significance.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) thanked M. Deflandre for the interesting communication which he had just made to the Section. It appeared to him, as he had listened to it, that the subject matter was concerned with technical terminology rather than with nomenclature. The two subjects were, however, closely related to one another and it was important that workers concerned with both subjects should keep in close touch with one another. M. Deflandre's communication would be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for consideration, though, for the reasons which he had explained, it seemed unlikely that the Commission would be able to take any positive action.

**Nomenclature
of fossil fragments
of the kind known
as organites or
sclerites in
invertebrates**

4. M. GEORGES DEFLANDRE then presented, on his behalf and that of Mme. Marthe Deflandre-Rigaud, a communication entitled "La nomenclature des fragments fossiles (organites et sclérites) d'Invertébrés?". M. Deflandre said that the tendency in applied micropalaeontology to make use of every vestige of organic life found in the sedimentary rocks gave rise to a general problem of nomenclature to which Croneis had proposed a solution. The bestowal of names upon fossil fragments of invertebrates of the kind known as organites or sclerites presented a special problem, for, although such a fragment was sufficient sometimes to characterise a species, more often such a determination was either doubtful or impossible. For practical reasons and because of their use in stratigraphy, it was necessary to designate such fragments by Latin binominal names formed in accordance with the Linnean system. In order, however, to meet the objections to this course expressed by certain biologists and to ward against the risk of erroneous interpretations, for example, attribution to a genus of unknown age, owing to the use of the particular generic name concerned for a microfossil,

⁷ For the text of the communication made by M. Deflandre and Mme. Deflandre-Rigaud, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 167.

it seemed desirable to ban the use for such fragments of the terms "genus" and "species" and of the names of genera already established. To deal with this problem, Croneis had proposed that the existing terms employed in biological nomenclature should be replaced for fossil fragments of the kind under discussion by a system of nomenclature based upon the *ordo militaris* of Ancient Rome. Thus, the hierarchy Class-Order-Family-Genus-Species would for the present purpose be replaced by the hierarchy Exercitus-Legio-Cohors-Manipulus-Centuria. Under this system, names belonging to these categories would, on being first published, be followed by *cohors nov.*, *manip. nov.*, *cent. nov.*, etc. It would be desirable, that, where a Manipulus appeared to be related morphologically to a living genus, it should be given the name of that genus with the addition of the termination "-ites".

A discussion then took place in which Professor di Caporiacco (Italy), M. Chavan (France) and Professor van Straelen (Belgium) took part. In the course of this discussion certain difficulties were foreseen in the application of a special system of nomenclature for fossil fragments of invertebrates independent of, but co-ordinated in some way with, the existing system of zoological nomenclature.

At the conclusion of this discussion THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, though it was evident that there were great difficulties in the way of accepting the plan formulated by Croneis to which M. Deflandre had drawn attention, the problem presented by these fossil fragments was a real one and deserved careful consideration. For himself, it seemed possible that the solution should be looked for in the field of technical terminology rather than in that of zoological nomenclature. The Section were grateful to M. Deflandre for having brought this matter to their attention. The communication which he had been good enough to make would be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

**Propositions
submitted by
Professor Pierre
Bonnet : proposed
procedure in regard
to**

5. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) a number of interesting propositions which he desired to lay before the Commission and the Congress^a. Since his arrival in Paris he had been so fortunate as to be able to have a full discussion with Professor Bonnet in regard to the procedure to be adopted in the handling of these propositions. As a result, he had agreed that the first of these propositions, which was concerned with the

^a For the text of the proposals submitted by Professor Bonnet, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 3: 171-179.

status* of the Arachnid names published by Clerck in 1757 in his *Aranei suecici*, a matter to which Professor Bonnet and his colleagues attached the greatest importance, should be brought before the Commission and the Section on Nomenclature at the first opportunity during the present Congress. The remaining propositions were concerned with various aspects of the *Règles* and included a number of proposals for drafting amendments and additions. In so far as time permitted, these would be dealt with by the Commission during its Paris Session and proposals in regard to them would be submitted by the Commission to the Section for approval. Any of Professor Bonnet's proposals which could not be dealt with in this way would be considered by the Commission after the close of the Congress and decisions reached as promptly as possible. He proposed therefore now to call upon Professor Bonnet to present his communication in regard to Clerck's Arachnid names.

PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that he was grateful to the President for the arrangements which he had proposed for handling the communications which he had submitted to the Commission. Those arrangements were perfectly satisfactory to him.

6. PROFESSOR PIERRE BONNET (FRANCE) said that he desired to bring forward a proposal relating to the status of the names of spiders published by Clerck in 1757 in his work entitled *Aranei suecici*⁹. This was a matter to which he and the Arachnologists associated with him attached an altogether outstanding importance. He would, he believed, be able to show that their claim that these names should be accorded rights under the Law of Priority was thoroughly well founded. What he was asking for was that these names should be recognised, notwithstanding the fact that they were published in 1757 and were thus anterior to the date prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature. It was a matter of indifference to him whether this end were achieved through the addition of a special saving clause to Article 26 or by any other means.

Before submitting the present application, he had consulted the entire body of specialists at present engaged in the study of Arachnology in any part of the world. Of the 62 workers concerned, replies had been received from 54. Of those who had replied, 48 had expressed themselves as in favour of the present petition, while four were opposed and two did not consider themselves sufficiently experienced to justify them in expressing an opinion.

Proposed validation for nomenclatorial purposes of the names published in Clerck, 1757, *Aranei Suecici* notwithstanding that that work was published before the starting point of zoological nomenclature

⁹ For the text of Professor Bonnet's communication, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **3** : 173—176.

Clerck's work contained the generic name *Araneus* and the oldest names for 54 species of spider; the species concerned were very common and they were to-day habitually known by Clerck's names. What was sought was the grant of official approval for this practice. If this request were now to be rejected, arachnological nomenclature would be plunged into a state of anarchy, for it could not be doubted that the specialists who now used the names published by Clerck would continue to do so, while those who were anxious to use those names but at present did not do so would use different names for the species concerned, though it would be necessary for such authors to cite also the names of Clerck in order to make clear the species to which they were referring. The recognition of the names published for spiders by Clerck would confer a great benefit on the nomenclature of Arachnology and would redound greatly to the credit of the nomenclaturists of 1948.

PROFESSOR L. DI CAPORIACCO (ITALY) said that he desired to support the proposal submitted by Professor Bonnet. The names published by Clerck were in almost universal use and it would be a grave error to cast the nomenclature of the group into confusion by a rigid adherence to the letter of the *Règles*. There was, in his view, a clear case for the grant of the relief sought by arachnologists.

M. ANDRÉ CHAVÁN (FRANCE) said that, while the present application was primarily one of interest to arachnologists, it was of great interest also to malacologists, for there was a book containing names of species of the Phylum Mollusca which was in a position very similar to that of Clerck's *Aranei svecici*. Malacologists were therefore much concerned in the outcome of the present application.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the problem presented by the spider names published by Clerck in 1757 had been the subject of argument since long before the adoption in 1901 of the present *Règles*. The decision taken at that time had given an absolute force to the Law of Priority but it had not been long before it had become apparent that the rigidity so imposed was insupportable and in consequence the Congress had decided at Monaco in 1913 to provide a means by which the Law of Priority could in certain circumstances be relaxed through the use by the Commission of the plenary powers then conferred by the Congress under which the Commission was

authorised to suspend the *Règles* where they were satisfied that greater confusion than uniformity would otherwise result. It was unfortunate that the present problem had not long ago been submitted to the Commission with a request that it should be dealt with under the plenary powers, for in a case of this sort nothing but added difficulty resulted from delay in seeking a decision from the Commission. Professor Bonnet had referred to the eminent French Arachnologist, M. Simon, who had himself been a member of the Commission from 1915 to 1921. The early records of the Commission had unfortunately been destroyed many years ago but there were indications in the surviving records which suggested that M. Simon had sought in some way to secure that this problem should be brought before the Commission. If such efforts had been made, they had apparently been unsuccessful. The present application was one which would certainly have commanded his enthusiastic support and it was fitting therefore that it should be at a meeting of the Congress held in Paris that this problem should be brought forward for final decision.

If the Section were to decide in principle that the present application should be granted, there would still remain a difficult choice regarding the method to be adopted for that purpose. He (the President) felt that it would be of advantage if further discussion of this application could be deferred to a later meeting in order that in the meanwhile the question of the means to be adopted for giving the relief desired, if such were decided upon by the Section, might be further studied. The case presented unusual features and it was desirable that the Section should be fully seized of all relevant considerations before they came to take a decision on the application submitted. He proposed therefore to hand the papers relating to this case to Professor di Caporiacco so that, when the Commission and the Section next considered this matter, he might be able to give a fuller *exposé* of the issues involved than had been possible at the present meeting. He hoped that this procedure would be agreeable to Professor Bonnet and to the Section as a whole.

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Minute 4)

THE SECTION agreed to defer until a later meeting the further consideration of the proposal that means should be found to make available under the *Règles* the Arachnid names published in Clerck's *Aranei svecici*, notwithstanding the fact that that work was published prior to 1758, i.e., prior to the date prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* as the starting point of zoological nomenclature.

Work of the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature in
the period 1935-
1948

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next matter to be considered was the report by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on its work during the period of thirteen years which had elapsed since the close of the meeting held in Lisbon in September, 1935. A detailed Report on this subject (Commission Paper (I.C.48)2) had been prepared by the Secretary to the Commission and this, the Commission proposed, should be submitted to the Congress at the same time as the Report on their work during the present Congress which they would themselves be submitting at a later meeting of the Section. The more important of the developments which had occurred between the Lisbon and Paris Congresses would be referred to in that Report, but the Commission felt that, in advance of the circulation of that Report, it would be convenient to the Section to be furnished with an account of the chief developments which had taken place since 1935.

The following is a summary of the statement then made by the President on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

At the close of the Lisbon meeting the Secretaryship to the Commission had fallen vacant through the resignation of that Office by Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.) after a distinguished tenure of office which had extended over a period of 38 years. The Commission had asked Dr. Stiles to officiate as Acting Secretary until the election of his successor. This had taken place in October, 1936, when Commissioner Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) had been elected to be Secretary. In consequence, the Secretariat of the Commission had then been transferred from Washington to London.

At the end of the year 1937 the Class 1937 completed its term of service and the Commission accordingly constituted a new Class (Class 1946), to which they elected the retiring members of the time-expired Class 1937, namely Commissioners Arndt, Calman, Esaki, Hankó, Jaczewski and Stiles.

In the early part of 1939 two additional Offices had been created by the Commission. The first, that of Vice-President, had been filled by the election thereto of Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.), while the second, that of Assistant Secretary, had been accepted by Commissioner James L. Peters (U.S.A.). On the death of Commissioner Stiles Commissioner Peters had been elected to be Vice-President.

It was naturally not possible for much work to be done during the period of about twelve months in which the Secretaryship was vacant but Dr. Stiles was nevertheless

able to arrange for the publication of one instalment of *Opinions*. The considerable task of transferring the Secretariat to its new headquarters, involving as it did the sorting of records, the introduction of a new system of registering and filing documents, the provision of accommodation, and the raising of funds, occupied the greater part of the period from 1936 to 1939, but in spite of these difficulties some progress was made with the consideration of current problems of nomenclature.

A situation of the utmost gravity for the Commission arose on the outbreak of war in Europe in September, 1939. Two measures of importance were then taken to ward against the dangers confronting the Commission. In the first place, arrangements were made to evacuate the vital records of the Commission from London to a place of safety in the country until such time as it was possible to judge of the effect of the expected air attacks on London. Having thus done everything possible to assure the safety of the physical assets of the Commission, it was necessary next to consider what measures were needed to ensure the continued existence of the Commission during the dangerous times lying ahead. The chief dangers to be apprehended were the risk that the Secretary to the Commission might be killed in an air attack and second that, if the war were to be protracted, the losses in personnel likely to be suffered through the lapsing of the Classes into which it was divided, supplemented by the deaths of Commissioners through old age or other causes, might so deplete the strength of the Commission that it would be a matter of great difficulty to restore the Commission to activity after the war was finished. Acting in consultation with the Secretary and after the best legal advice had been obtained, the President accordingly decided to assume for the duration of the war such extraordinary powers as might be necessary to ensure the continued existence of the Commission as a body. For this purpose he had executed an instrument entitled "Emergency Powers Declaration, 1939". Acting under the powers so assumed, the President in due course constituted the Class 1949 to replace the time-expired Class 1940 and later the Class 1952 to replace the Class 1943, appointing to the new Classes the members of the Classes which had completed their term of service. As so constituted, the Class 1949 included Señor Angel Cabrera, Mr. Frederick Chapman, Mr. Francis Hemming, Dr. Karl Jordan, Professor J. Pellegrin and Professor R. Richter, while the Class 1952 included Dr. A. do Amaral, Professor L. di Caporiaceo, Professor J. R. Dymond, Dr. James L. Peters, there having

been two vacancies in the former Class 1943. Under the same powers, the President confirmed in their offices those members of the Commission who held offices of the Commission when those offices fell vacant upon the completion of the term of service of the Commissioners by whom they had been held at the outbreak of the war. In assuming these extraordinary powers, the President had stipulated that any action taken thereunder should be reported to the Commission as soon as possible after the close of hostilities and further that the Commission should furnish a report thereon to the Congress at its next meeting in order that the Congress should be fully informed of the action taken and should have an opportunity of expressing their approval of that action in the same way that the Budapest Congress of 1927 gave their approval to certain somewhat similar action taken by the then Secretary to the Commission after the close of the war of 1914-18.

At the close of the year 1946 the Class 1946 completed its term of service and the Commission constituted in its place the Class 1955, electing thereto four of the retiring members of the Class 1946 (namely Commissioners Boschma, Calnan, Hankó, Stoll). The future position of two members of the former Class 1946 was reserved for further consideration, in the case of Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan), because of circumstances arising out of the late war, in the case of Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland), because his whereabouts at that time were unknown.

When the Lisbon Congress closed in September, 1935, there were two vacancies in the membership of the Commission, of which one was due to the death of Commissioner Anton Handlirsch (Austria). Between the Lisbon Congress and the outbreak of war in 1939, the Commission had suffered two further losses through the death first of Commissioner H. B. Fantham (Canada) and later of Commissioner Witmer Stone (U.S.A.). As was to be expected, other similar losses occurred during the war, though it was not possible to ascertain the total extent of these losses until the war was over. It was then found that five members of the Commission had died since the outbreak of the war, namely Commissioners C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.), Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.), Frederick Chapman (Australia), Walther Arndt (Germany), Jacques Pellegrin (France). The deaths of these old and valued colleagues were a severe loss to the Commission. The death of Commissioner Arndt came as an especial blow, for his death was due not to natural causes but was caused by the action of the Gestapo by whom, during the war, he was arrested and executed for no other reason apparently than his

intellectual integrity and his attachment to the conception of co-operation between men of science, irrespective of nationality.

In addition, the Commission lost three members through resignation in the period which had elapsed since their meeting in Lisbon in 1935. The Commissioners concerned were: Karl Apstein (Germany); Filippo Silvestri (Italy); Candido Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain). Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary) had already resigned at the time of the Lisbon Congress.

All the vacancies which occurred in the membership of the Commission between the close of the Lisbon meeting in September, 1939, and the outbreak of war were filled by the election of new Commissioners. In all, six Commissioners were so elected, namely: Senhor Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) *vice* the late Commissioner A. Handlirsch (Austria); Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) *vice* Commissioner Geza Horváth (Hungary) (resigned); Professor Walther Arndt (Germany) *vice* Commissioner Karl Apstein (Germany) (resigned); Professor Lodovico di Caporiacco (Italy) *vice* Commissioner F. Silvestri (Italy) (resigned); Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) *vice* Commissioner H. B. Fantham (Canada) (deceased); Dr. Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) *vice* Commissioner Bolivar y Pieltain (Spain) (resigned). The following additional elections were made either during the war or since the close of hostilities to fill vacancies in the membership of the Commission: Professor James Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner Witmer Stone (U.S.A.); Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner L. Stejneger (U.S.A.); Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) *vice* the late Commissioner C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.); Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) *vice* the late Commissioner F. Chapman (Australia); Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) *vice* the late Commissioner W. Arndt (Germany); Dr. Th. Mortensen (Denmark) *vice* the late Professor J. Pellegrin (France); Dr. Paul Rode (France) *vice* the former Commissioner T. Jaczewski (Poland).

The interruption in international communications caused by the war had been so serious that it was felt that it would not be correct to proceed with the rendering of *Opinions* on current problems of nomenclature. This did not mean, however, that no *Opinions* were rendered during that period, for on the outbreak of war in 1939 there were 45 cases on which decisions had been taken by the Commission at Lisbon on which no *Opinion* had been rendered. During the war *Opinions* were rendered and published on all these cases. In addition, certain cases which had been submitted

to the Commission for vote before the outbreak of war and on which therefore every Commissioner had had an opportunity of expressing his views were completed and *Opinions* rendered on them. Altogether 71 *Opinions* had been rendered since the meeting of the Commission held in Lisbon in 1935. These *Opinions* were: (a) *Opinions* 124-133, for the publication of which by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, arrangements had been made by Dr. Stiles during the period in which he was officiating as Acting Secretary to the Commission; (b) *Opinions* 134-181, in which were embodied decisions taken by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935; (c) *Opinions* 182-194, dealing with matters on which decisions had been reached since the Lisbon meeting. A start had been made also with the re-publication of the older *Opinions* which had long been out of print and of which copies had become unobtainable. *Opinions* 1-16 had been re-published in this way. Explanatory editorial notes had been added drawing attention to certain features of those *Opinions* which had been modified by later decisions of the Commission or the Congress. It was proposed during the present meeting to place proposals before the Section for the integration into the *Règles* of the *Opinions* already rendered by the Commission; the adoption of the proposals of the Commission under this head would make it possible to dispense with editorial notes of this kind when the remaining *Opinions* came to be re-published.

In addition to publishing the *Opinions* described above, the Commission had published during the war twelve resolutions on various important questions affecting nomenclatorial practice which had been adopted at various times by the Commission or the Congress, many of which had been largely overlooked by reason of not having been published except in the somewhat inaccessible volumes of the proceedings of successive meetings of the Congress. The resolutions so published had been grouped in a series to which the title *Declaration* had been given, to distinguish it from the series of *Opinions*.

When in 1939 it had been decided that the Commission should in future itself publish its own publications, it was decided also that the *Opinions* of the Commission should be issued in a succession of volumes of a single work entitled "Opinions rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature." Publication started in August, 1939, when the Commission published the first three parts of volume 2 of the above work, of which volume 1 was reserved for the re-publication of the earlier *Opinions* published at different times between 1907 and 1936. Publication of this volume was started in 1943, at which

time the title of the work was extended to include a reference also to the *Declarations* rendered by the Commission. In 1944 it was decided to reserve the remainder of volume 2, of which by that time 26 Parts had been published, for the *Opinions* recording the decisions taken by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935, and to start publication of volume 3, containing the *Opinions* adopted since the Lisbon meeting, the two volumes to be published concurrently.

It was only to be expected that the profound dislocation resulting from the war should have created serious difficulties for the Commission as for all other international scientific bodies. Every effort had, however, been made by the Secretary to the Commission not only to keep in close touch with all the available members of the Commission but also by the publication of papers containing interim accounts of the current work of the Commission and its Secretariat and by a very extensive correspondence with specialists in all parts of the world with which postal communications with Great Britain were then open to keep zoologists as fully informed as possible of what was in progress and to maintain their interest in the international regulation of zoological nomenclature. The success of these efforts could be judged by the rapid growth in the number of applications submitted to the Commission and in the volume of the scientific correspondence of the Commission during the later years of the war and in the period which had since elapsed. Further, wherever, as in the United States and elsewhere, groups of specialists had established committees for the study of zoological nomenclature in relation to their specialities, the Secretary to the Commission had entered into relations with the committees so formed and had done everything possible to foster co-operation between those committees and the Commission. This policy, which had been formally adopted by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935 when they had adopted the resolution which had since been embodied in *Declaration 10*, clearly offered great opportunities for valuable progress on co-operative lines, a considerable number of interesting and valuable contributions having already been made to the work of the Commission by bodies of this sort established in the United States and Great Britain.

Administrative and financial problems were a constant source of anxiety to the Commission, for when the Secretariat of the Commission was transferred to London consequent upon the election of the present Secretary, the Commission had possessed no funds of any kind, its small out-of-pocket expenses having previously been met from

an annual grant made not to the Commission but personally to the previous Secretary by the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., the same institution at the same time undertaking the publication of the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission. The first task after the transfer of the Secretariat to Europe had therefore been to raise a small preliminary fund with which to finance the initial activities of the Commission in the new phase of existence on which it was entering. Some three hundred pounds (£300) had been raised in this way by donations made to the Commission by the Royal Society of London and other learned societies in London. The funds so received were most valuable as providing the means for making a start with the work of the Commission but they were obviously inadequate to meet the cost even of discharging the obligations in the matter of publications to which the Commission must regard itself as being committed if it was to work off the arrears of work with which it was already confronted. It was in the hope of raising the funds necessary to carry through this limited programme that in 1943 the Secretary to the Commission issued an appeal for a fund of £1,800. The success of this appeal put an end to the immediate anxieties of the Commission and the situation was further greatly improved when the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation made a conditional grant in 1947 up to a maximum of \$10,900 and a similar grant up to a maximum of \$10,600 for the year 1948.

It had to be recognised, however, that the basis on which the Commission was now operating was extremely precarious, for while the grants made by UNESCO covered essential office expenditure and greatly assisted the Commission's publications, the central problem facing the Commission remained entirely untouched. The entire functioning of the Commission depended at present upon the efforts of the the Honorary Secretary who was not only an unpaid part-time officer but was able to give to the service of the Commission only his spare time in the evenings and at week-ends, his days being necessarily devoted to earning his livelihood in an entirely different occupation. The work of the office of the Commission had now grown to dimensions which, if the work were to be discharged promptly and efficiently, called for the employment of a whole-time salaried official, who would have not only to be thoroughly acquainted with the problems of zoological nomenclature but should himself also be a specialist in the systematics of some branch of the Animal Kingdom, for without the knowledge which could only be obtained in this way no such official could properly perform the

duties which would fall to him to discharge. Before such an official could be appointed and could take over the bulk of the duties discharged by the present spare-time honorary Secretary, the Commission would need not only to have funds sufficient to pay the substantial salary which any zoologist possessing the requisite qualifications would have to be given but also to be in possession of an income sufficiently assured to enable it to offer a reasonable degree of security of tenure to any zoologist to whom the post might be offered. At present the Commission's funds were entirely insufficient to cover the cost of the salary of such an official. Even if this difficulty could be overcome, the sources of the income of the Commission were far from assured, the greater part consisting of a grant made from year to year by UNESCO, which in the present state of international affairs could not be regarded as providing the security that was necessary before the Commission could appoint a highly qualified whole-time official. For the time being, the present honorary Secretary was prepared to continue to give his spare time to the work of the Commission, but obviously this arrangement could not be looked upon as permanent. When it came to an end the Commission—and zoologists who looked to the Commission for assistance in their work—would be confronted with the likelihood of the complete breakdown of the machinery of the Commission unless in the meanwhile effective steps had been taken to meet the situation so created. The present Secretary had done everything in his power to bring this serious problem to the attention of leading zoological institutions but it must be admitted that, while most anxious that the work of the Commission should continue without interruption and indeed desirous of seeing it expanded in various directions, not a single one of the great institutions to which this matter had been submitted had as yet taken any effective steps to deal with the problem. In zoological nomenclature, as in private life, people could not expect indefinitely to get something for nothing. False hopes of this kind could only lead to the discontinuance of the services at present being rendered free of cost. The problem was therefore one of the utmost gravity and importance to every zoologist interested in the maintenance of international regulation in the field of zoological nomenclature. This question was thus brought before the present Congress as one which called for immediate and effective action by those zoologists who held the principal posts in the national museums of natural history in different parts of the world, for it was only the zoologists who held such posts who were in a position to concert the necessary action.

Notwithstanding the great difficulties created by the war, a development of outstanding importance was initiated in the year 1943, when it was decided to establish on behalf of the Commission a journal which would be the Official Organ of the Commission. The journal so founded, the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, had received a warm welcome and had reached a stage at which its printing costs were covered by the receipts from sales. This result had been achieved only by setting at a high level the price charged for individual parts. This policy had been subject to a certain amount of criticism on the part of zoologists who were accustomed to obtaining other scientific journals at a much lower cost. The zoologists who argued in favour of a reduction in the prices charged had failed however to demonstrate that the loss involved could be made good by increased subscriptions. On the face of it, it was most unlikely that this result would be achieved, for it was notorious that in existing world conditions the demand for scientific publications was extremely inelastic. Nevertheless, it was clearly desirable on general grounds that the publications of the Commission should be sold at the lowest practicable prices and thus made available to the widest possible circle of zoologists. As an experiment, therefore, a portion of the grant from UNESCO earmarked for publications would be used for reducing the price charged for the Commission's publications. This experiment would be continued so long as the necessary funds were provided by UNESCO, but should those funds cease to be available the policy would have to be reconsidered if in the meantime sales had not increased sufficiently to cover production costs.

Two other plans of importance were launched in the year 1943, the first being that for the publication of the substantive French text of the *Règles*, which had long been out of print, with an accurate translation into English, which did not at that time exist, the English translation in common use being imperfect in many ways, being both incomplete in certain respects and containing also serious errors of translation. Considerable progress had been achieved in the preparation of this edition and a large number of zoological institutions and individual zoologists had enrolled themselves as prospective subscribers. A grant towards the cost of printing had been received from the Royal Society of London. The project had, however, been put on one side until after the present Congress, it being considered that zoologists would prefer to see publication postponed until after the present Congress so that the new edition might take account of any amendments to the *Règles* that might be adopted at Paris.

The second of the two projects started in 1943 was the publication, in book form, of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," which had become virtually useless as an instrument for the stabilisation of generic nomenclature through not being accessible in the form of a single volume. The task of preparing this work for publication had been extremely arduous, the Secretary having found it necessary to verify every bibliographical reference given in the *Opinions*, by means of which names had been placed on the "Official List," many of which were found to be incorrect, and also to ascertain the original place of publication of the large number of names placed on, or otherwise cited in, the "Official List," for which no bibliographical references had been given in the *Opinions* concerned. The greater part of this task had, however, now been completed and a substantial portion of the "Official List" was already in the hands of the printer. A grant towards the cost of printing had been made in this case also by the Royal Society of London, and a large number of zoological institutions and individual zoologists had enrolled themselves as prospective subscribers.

The multifarious developments in the work of the Commission since the outbreak of war in 1939 had made it necessary to give careful consideration to the financial structure to be adopted for the ordering of the affairs of the Commission. From the moment in 1938 when the Commission first became possessed of any funds at all, a firm of professional Chartered Accountants had been employed to audit the accounts every year and the accounts so audited had been published in the Commission's *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, together with an explanatory report. The fact however that the Commission, being an unincorporated body, possessed no juridical personality of its own and could not enter into any form of contract became increasingly unsatisfactory, as the scale of the activities of the Commission gathered momentum, for the absence of an incorporated status for the Commission had meant that it had been necessary for the Secretary to the Commission personally to assume financial responsibility for all actions taken in the name of the Commission. The situation so created clearly could not be allowed to continue, and accordingly, after consultation with all the members of the Commission, steps were taken by the Secretary to form a corporation under United Kingdom law which would assume full responsibility for the management of the funds of the Commission. It was not found possible actually to incorporate the Commission, for, owing to its international character, there were not a sufficient number of members of the Commission available to attend business meetings of the Corporation. In order to get over this difficulty it was

agreed that the corporation should include among its members the minimum number of persons normally resident in the United Kingdom necessary to ensure a quorum at meetings in addition to all the members of the Commission. The Articles of Association of the corporation were so drafted as to ensure that the Trust, when dealing with funds contributed for the purposes of the Commission, should be empowered only to expend those funds on purposes approved by the Commission, which was therefore assured of full control over the expenditure of those funds. The corporation so constituted was formally brought into existence at the beginning of 1947 with the title "International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature." The chairmanship of the Trust was accepted by the Right Hon. Walter Elliot, a former British Cabinet Minister. The Secretary to the Commission was Managing Director and Secretary of the Trust.

Ever since the end of the war it had been evident that the present Congress would be of outstanding importance, and that if any early reforms were to be made in zoological nomenclature they must be made on that occasion, for it was the Congress alone which possessed authority to modify the *Règles*. Particular efforts had therefore been made by the Secretary to the Commission to ascertain, by correspondence and personal discussion, the general wishes of zoologists regarding the directions in which the *Règles* could be improved and clarified, the membership of the Commission placed on a more genuinely international and representative basis and its procedure so reformed as to enable it to function in an efficient and businesslike manner. This preparatory work had been greatly assisted by a visit paid by the Secretary to the United States and Canada at Christmas, 1947. This visit had been undertaken at the invitation of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, which had made a grant also towards the travelling expenses so incurred. This visit had been of exceptional value and interest, for it had made it possible for the Secretary to hold a conference with the United States members of the Commission as well as to hold extensive and comprehensive discussions with the specialists at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, the American Museum of Natural History, New York, and the Chicago Museum of Natural History and with the large gathering of zoologists attending the annual meeting at Chicago of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the equally representative gathering of palaeontologists attending the annual meeting at Ottawa of the Paleontological Society of America held during the annual meeting of the Geological Society of America. By means of these discussions it had been

possible both to ascertain the directions in which, in the view of the American workers concerned, further progress was desirable, and also to place before those specialists particulars of the subjects proposed to be raised at the Paris Congress. Nothing could have been of greater value to the Commission than these discussions, for they placed it in possession of the views of American workers in a way which would otherwise have been quite impossible of achievement, a consideration which was of especial importance in view of the fact that the Congress was to meet in the following year and that its place of meeting was to be in Europe.

THE PRESIDENT added that, while the account which he had given of the work of the Commission and of its Secretariat during the 13 years which had elapsed since the last meeting of the Congress covered all the main points of importance, the Report prepared by the Secretary to the Commission dealt with these questions much more fully and would be found to contain information on a large number of other matters of interest. The report which he had just made contained no proposals for action. It was proposed, however, as the next item on the agenda, to present a short oral report from the Commission, in which would be included a number of specific proposals which the Commission desired to bring before the Section and for which they sought the approval of the Section and, through the Section, the approval of the Congress.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the work of the Commission and its Secretariat during the period of 13 years between the close in 1935 of the meeting of the Congress held in Lisbon and the opening of the present Congress and agreed that the detailed Report on these matters prepared by the Secretary to the Commission should be presented to the Congress at the same time as the Report to be prepared by the Commission on the work carried out during the present meeting of the Congress.

**Report by the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature on
action taken at
its present (Paris)
Session in regard
to matters of
personnel and
recommendations
on such matters
submitted to the
Congress for
approval**

8. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, now that the Section had been furnished with a full report on all matters of importance which had arisen in connection with the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in the period between the close of the Lisbon Congress in September, 1935, and the opening of the present Congress in July, 1948, he proposed to lay before the Section a report on the action taken by the Commission during its present Session in regard to various matters affecting its personnel and allied questions and at the same time to submit various recommendations in

regard to questions arising in this field, for which the Commission sought the approval of the Section and, through the Section, the approval of the Congress.

The Section would recall that at previous meetings of the Congress the International Commission had devoted a portion of their Report to a description of the changes in the personnel of the Commission which had occurred since the last meeting of the Congress and had included in the same portion of their Report such recommendations in regard to matters of this kind as they desired to submit for approval, first by the Section and second by the Congress in *Concilium Plenum*. On this occasion also the Commission proposed to deal with these matters in the Report which they would lay before the Section at a later meeting, but they felt that, in view of the fact that it had happily been possible to arrange for a substantially larger number of meetings of the Section than had been customary on previous occasions, it would be both more courteous to the Section and more suited to the general convenience if on the present occasion they were to submit to the Section the recommendations for which they desired the approval of the Section and the Congress before they drafted the portion of their Report dealing with this subject. Their task in preparing that document would clearly be greatly simplified if they knew in advance that their recommendations in this field had already received the approval of the Section. For the Section, also, the Commission believed that the procedure now adopted would prove agreeable, affording, as it did, the maximum opportunity for discussion on any proposal on which such discussion might be desired.

The first matter which it was the duty of the Commission to report to the Section was that to their great regret they had received a notification from their old friend and highly esteemed colleague Commissioner Karl Jordan of his desire to be relieved of the burden of the presidency of the Commission on account of advancing years and the misfortune of almost total deafness. Dr. Jordan had been a member of the Commission continuously for a period of 35 years, having been first elected a Commissioner at the meeting of the Congress held at Monaco in 1913. Of that period he had been the President of the Commission for 19 years, having been elected to that Office in 1929 following the death of his eminent Italian predecessor, the late Professor F. S. Monticelli. First as an individual member of the Commission and later as its President, Dr. Jordan had brought to the service of the Commission a wealth of knowledge and a wisdom of counsel which had been of the greatest value. On succeeding to the presidency

he had added to these a high sense of judicial impartiality which had been of the utmost service to the Commission and had greatly contributed to its prestige and authority. The Section would be glad to learn that, although Dr. Jordan would no longer be the President of the Commission, he had consented to remain one of its members. The Commission hoped therefore that for many years to come they would have the benefit of Dr. Jordan's ripe knowledge and experience. The Section felt that it would be the wish of the Congress to confer upon Dr. Jordan some signal mark of the high appreciation in which they held him, and they accordingly desired to suggest that the Congress should create, on an *ad hoc* basis, an Office of Honorary Life President and should offer that Office to Dr. Jordan as a mark of their esteem and respect.

To fill the presidency left vacant by the retirement of Dr. Jordan, the Commission recommended the election thereto of Dr. James Lee Peters (U.S.A.), who had been a member of the Commission since 1933 and Vice-President since 1947. The Commission felt confident that the impartiality and dignity of this high Office would be in safe keeping in Dr. Peters' hands and they warmly commended to the Section and to the Congress their proposal that he should be elected to be their new President.

The Commission had nominated Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) to be Vice-President in the place of Commissioner James L. Peters, on the election of the latter to be President. The Commission commended this nomination to the favourable consideration of the Congress.

The Commission had decided to abolish the Office of Assistant Secretary, as at present constituted, and to make the title of "Assistant Secretary" available for an honorary (spare-time) personal assistant to the honorary (spare-time) Secretary.

The Commission had next to report that, owing to the absence of President Jordan for the reasons which had already been explained and of Vice-President Peters which was due to various reasons outside his control, the only Officer of the Commission in attendance at the present Session was their Secretary, Commissioner Francis Hemming, to whom, therefore, had fallen the duty of officiating as Acting President of the Commission during the present Congress.

The high cost of travel, the difficulties arising from the exchange control imposed by many countries and other disturbing factors resulting from the recent world war, had made it impossible for a number of the members of the Commission to attend the present Congress. Of the total

membership, the following five were in attendance: Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands); Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.); Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy); Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom); M. Paul Rode (France). Up to the last moment Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) had fully intended to be present but almost on the eve of his departure from Copenhagen for Paris he had been ordered by his medical advisers to abandon the journey. Dr. Mortensen had been a member of the Congress for many years and was held in the highest esteem not only by his colleagues on the Commission but also by his many friends in the general body of the Congress. The Commission had sent Dr. Mortensen a telegram expressing their great regret at his absence and the reasons which had made it unavoidable, and they felt sure that the Section and the Congress would wish to associate themselves in this message of sympathy and affection.

In accordance with the procedure approved by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology held at Budapest in 1927 and confirmed by the subsequent meetings of the Congress, the Commission had taken steps to invite certain eminent and representative zoologists of various nationalities to act as Alternate Members of the Commission during its present Session in the place of Commissioners who for one reason or another were unable to be present. The members of the Congress so appointed to be Alternate Members of the Commission were:—Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico) *vice* Commissioner Angel Cabrera (Argentina); Dr. Edward Hindle (United Kingdom) *vice* President Karl Jordan (United Kingdom); Professor Arthur Ricardo Jorge (Portugal) *vice* Commissioner Afranio do Amaral (Brazil); Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.); Professor Z. P. Metcalf (U.S.A.) *vice* Vice-President James L. Peters (U.S.A.); Mr. Norman D. Riley (United Kingdom) *vice* Commissioner W. T. Calman (United Kingdom); Professor R. Spärck (Denmark) *vice* Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark); Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium) *vice* Commissioner R. Richter (Germany); Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.) *vice* Commissioner Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.). No Alternate Members had as yet been appointed in the place of the following Commissioners who were unable to attend the present Congress:—Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada); Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary); Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia).

The Commission considered it a matter of the utmost importance that every possible measure should be taken to maintain and strengthen the bonds between the Commission on the one hand and the general body of zoologists

on the other. In particular, the Commission attached the greatest significance to the establishment of close and harmonious relations between itself and the members of the Congress on those occasions when the Commission and the Congress were meeting concurrently. Inspired by these motives, the Commission had decided at their first meeting that all their meetings during the present Congress should be held in public and thus thrown open to every member of the Congress. This decision, which had been posted on the Notice Board of the Congress, had received a warm welcome from the members of the Congress. It had given the Commission the opportunity of bringing into close personal consultation leading zoologists present at the Congress and it had enabled those zoologists actively to participate in the work of the Commission and thus become better acquainted both with the problems involved and with the spirit in which the Commission approached its task.

The Commission had next the sad duty to report the death since the last meeting of the Congress of seven of their members. Of these six had died from old age or other natural causes, while one was brutally murdered during the war by the Gestapo in Berlin. The Commissioners concerned were: Dr. H. B. Fantham (Canada); Dr. Witmer Stone (U.S.A.); Dr. C. W. Stiles (U.S.A.); Dr. Leonhard Stejneger (U.S.A.); Mr. Frederick Chapman (Australia); Dr. Walther Arndt (Germany); Professor Jacques Pellegrin (France). The Commission felt sure that the Section would wish to mark their respect for their colleagues who had died during the period 1935-1948 by rising in their places and standing in silence for two minutes.

(The members of the Section on Nomenclature then rose in their places and stood for two minutes in silence to mark their respect for the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature who had died during the period 1935-1948.)

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT said that the Commission felt certain that the Section on Nomenclature and the entire Congress would wish emphatically to condemn the abominable crime which had robbed them of their colleague Dr. Walther Arndt, who, the mildest and most inoffensive of men and one who had devoted his whole life and much of his fortune to the advancement of science, had been hurriedly arrested in Berlin during the war and had suffered death by the headman's axe. This disgraceful murder, which was apparently due to no other reason than Dr. Arndt's intellectual integrity and to his attachment to

the conception of co-operation between men of science irrespective of nationality, was an ineffaceable outrage on the whole body of men of science. The Commission proposed therefore to refer especially to this matter in the Report which they would later submit to the Section.

In the report by the Secretary to the Commission on the work of that body during the period 1935-1948 which had already been presented, the Section had been informed of the elections made by the Commission during that period to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation, or by the expiry of the term of service of Classes in the membership of the Commission. The Commission asked the Section and the Congress to approve and confirm the election of the Commissioners concerned.

The Section had also been furnished by the Secretary with particulars of the extraordinary powers assumed by the President on the outbreak of war in 1939 for the purpose of assuring the continued existence of the Commission in the dangerous period into which it was then entering, and of the action taken by the President under those powers. The Commission were certain that the Section would wish to commend the vigorous and effective action taken by the President in this matter and would give it their retrospective approval.

The Commission had also to report that they had lost touch with one of their members, Professor T. Jaczewski (Poland), who, through the circumstances of the recent war, had become a Displaced Person. In the circumstances, the Commission had thought it right to treat Professor Jaczewski's place on the Commission as having become vacant in like manner as though he had died or had resigned. The Commission sought the approval of the Section both for the action so taken and also for the adoption of permanent regulations authorising the adoption of similar action if a comparable situation were ever to recur.

The Class 1949 of the membership of the Commission would complete its term of service at the end of the present Congress. The Commission had nominated the following retiring Commissioners to serve for a further term as Commissioners: Cabrera (Argentina); Hemming (United Kingdom); Jordan (United Kingdom); Pearson (Australia). The Commission recommended that in the future, as in the past, one-third of the total membership of the Commission should vacate their position at the end of each meeting of the Congress, the members so retiring being eligible, however, for immediate re-election, but that the system of 9-year Classes should be discontinued as, in view of the irregularity with which meetings of the Congress were held,

this system had outlived its usefulness. In its place the Commission proposed that the names of the members of the Commission should be arranged in the order in which they had been elected or, most recently, been re-elected members, and that at the close of each meeting of the Congress the third part of the Commission comprising the members of the Commission with the longest service since election, or latest re-election, should complete its term of service.

The Commission had also to report that they had nominated Professor R. Spärek (Denmark) to be a member of the Commission, and that he had consented to serve as such. The Commission asked for confirmation of this election.

Each Officer of the Commission vacated his appointment on completion of his term of service as a Commissioner but was eligible for immediate reappointment on being re-elected a member of the Commission. In consequence of this rule, the Secretaryship of the Commission would fall vacant at the end of the present Congress. The Commission had nominated Mr. Francis Henning (United Kingdom) for a further term of Office as Secretary and they commended this nomination to the favourable consideration of the Congress.

A difficult situation had arisen in regard to the position of two of the zoologists who, at the outbreak of war, had been members of the Commission. The Commissioners concerned were: Professor Rudolf Richter (Germany) and Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan). The study of zoology was, or should be, entirely divorced from political considerations, but, in view of the circumstances existing in Germany and Japan respectively immediately before the outbreak of the recent war, the nature of which was well known to all members of the Congress, the Commission, after the most careful consideration, had come to the conclusion that it was desirable to afford to the zoologists of Germany and Japan respectively a fresh opportunity of expressing their wishes as to the zoologists by whom they desired respectively to be represented on the Commission. Pending the completion of this consultation, the Commission did not propose to recommend the re-election of these two Commissioners. The Commission asked the Congress to endorse this recommendation. The Commission, in putting forward the foregoing recommendations, wished to make it clear that the conclusion which they had reached in this matter had been taken on grounds of principle and was not intended to reflect, and did not, in fact, reflect, either upon the professional eminence of Professor Richter or Professor Esaki or upon the value of the services rendered to the

Commission by those zoologists while serving as Commissioners.

Since the last meeting of the Congress the Commission had actively pursued the policy set forth in their *Declaration* 10 of encouraging in every way the establishment of groups of specialists to study problems of zoological nomenclature affecting their own groups. Wherever such groups had been established, the closest possible relations had been established with the Commission through action initiated on their behalf by their Secretary. The Commission looked forward to the time when each of the principal groups of the Animal Kingdom would be covered by a group of this kind and when also the national museums of natural history in each of the principal countries would possess a committee on nomenclature, through which the Commission could obtain an indication of the feeling of zoologists in that institution on current problems as they arose.

A proposal was then moved and seconded that the recommendations submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the personnel of the Commission and matters connected therewith be approved by the Section and submitted to the International Congress of Zoology for approval in *Concilium Plenum*. After an opportunity had been given to any member of the Section to move an amendment to this proposal, and no member had signified his desire to bring forward such an amendment, THE PRESIDENT then put the foregoing proposal to the Section by whom it was unanimously adopted.

Despatch of a telegram to Dr. Karl Jordan offering the office of Honorary Life President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

9. THE PRESIDENT said that now that the Section had approved the proposal of the Commission that a special Office of Honorary Life President of the Commission be created and that this Office be offered to Dr. Karl Jordan on the occasion of his resignation of the Office of President of the Commission, it would, he felt sure, be the wish of the Section that he should address a telegram to Dr. Jordan informing him of the action taken by the Section to mark the affection and esteem in which they held him.

THE SECTION invited the President to telegraph to Dr. Jordan in this sense.

Thanks to UNESCO for financial assistance granted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

10. THE SECTION agreed to place on record their warm appreciation of the interest in, and the understanding of the needs of, the work of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature shown by UNESCO and their grateful thanks for the munificent subvention made to the funds of the Commission by UNESCO in the year 1947 and for the continuation of that support in the year 1948.

Thanks to donors
of contributions to
the funds of the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

11. THE SECTION agreed to place on record their thanks to all Government Agencies, Museums and other Scientific Institutions, Learned Societies and individual zoologists and palacontologists in all parts of the world who, during the period 1938-1948, had assisted the work of the Commission by making donations to its funds.

Communication
addressed to the
Congress on
behalf of the
Austrian
zoologists

12. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that since his arrival in Paris he had received a communication signed jointly by Professor Otto Storch, President of the Zoological Institute of Vienna, Dr. Karl Holdhaus, Director of the Natural History Museum, and Dr. U. Stundral, Secretary-General of the Zoologisch-Botanische Gesellschaft of Vienna, on behalf of the zoologists of Austria. In this communication the Austrian zoologists had expressed the view that a fundamental reform in the *Règles* was required in order to secure that well-known names should not be upset through the operation of the Law of Priority. That such changes should be avoided should, the Austrian zoologists considered, be regarded as a fundamental principle which should be constantly borne in mind. Any changes that might be made in the *Règles* should be founded upon this principle. The Austrian zoologists greatly regretted that circumstances prevented them from attending the present Congress. They asked that no changes involving the reform which they sought should be made in the *Règles* until a later meeting at which they could be present and would prefer that no changes of any kind should be made until such a meeting could be held.

THE PRESIDENT said that all zoologists regretted that, through circumstances arising out of the late war, it was not possible for zoologists of every country to be represented at the present Congress. It was not possible however on this account to put a complete stop upon all progress in the reform of the *Règles*. It was very evident from the attitude of the zoologists attending the present Congress and also from that of many who were unable to be present that zoologists generally would regard both the Commission and the Congress as deserving of blame if at the present Congress they were to fail to make an effort to remove the more obvious of the blemishes in the present *Règles* and to fill in the more obvious of the gaps which marred those *Règles*. The actual proposal which was particularly advocated by the Austrian zoologists, namely, the placing of limitations upon the Law of Priority in the interests of stability in nomenclature, was a matter which was uppermost in the minds of many zoologists in all parts

of the world. The Section had just had a most interesting and illuminating discussion on this very subject on proposals put forward by Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) and by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France). Many members of the Section would evidently have liked to see an immediate decision taken on those proposals, but the Section had recognised that, while many zoologists attached the greatest importance to the early recognition of a Law of Prescription imposed for the sake of preserving names in common use, there were others who were not at the present Congress who did not share this view. The Section had therefore—very wisely, as he thought—decided to defer taking a decision on this matter until the next Congress when every group of zoologists would have had a further opportunity of considering the question not as a theoretical but as a practical issue. In the meanwhile the Commission were to undertake a thorough study of the whole problem on the basis of a comprehensive consultation with specialists in all countries. On this issue, which the Austrian zoologists considered to be the most important now awaiting decision, the action which the Section had taken would be completely agreeable to the zoologists of Austria. If the Section approved, he (the President) proposed to write to Professor Storch in the foregoing sense. The communication submitted to the Congress by Professor Storch and his colleagues would be attached to the record of the present discussion, together with the text of whatever reply was sent thereto.

THE SECTION took note of the communication addressed to the Congress by Professor Storch and other Viennese zoologists on behalf of the zoologists of Austria, approved the statement of policy made by the President and invited him to reply to Professor Storch in the terms which he had proposed.

(For the text of the communication received from Professor Storch and other Viennese zoologists on behalf of the zoologists of Austria and of the President's reply thereto, see Appendix¹⁰.)

Amendment of the
"Règles": proposals
submitted by the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

13. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he proposed now to invite the Section to turn to what was both the most important and the most responsible of the duties committed to them by the Congress, namely, the examination of proposals submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the amendment of the *Règles*. At former meetings of the Congress the opportunity afforded to the Section for the discussion of such proposals had been very limited, for the fact that the Section had usually held only one meeting during each

¹⁰ See pp. 77—78.

Congress had made it inevitable that the first intimation to the Section of a desire by the Commission to secure a change in the *Règles* was on the presentation by the Commission of the Report which they had prepared for submission to the Congress. It would therefore have been difficult for the Section effectively to dissent from the proposals of the Commission without at the same time rejecting the Report prepared by the Commission. On the present occasion the Commission had charged him on their behalf to submit to the Section an oral statement setting out the recommendations for which they sought the approval of the Section in advance of the preparation of their Report to the Congress. If on any of the questions involved the Section were to take a view different from that recommended, the Commission would consider the matter further before finally deciding upon the terms of their Report to the Congress. The Commission were hopeful however that it would be found that the recommendations now to be submitted would meet with the approval of the Section, for each of those recommendations had been agreed upon by the Commission at a public meeting at which any member of the Congress had been free to be present and which had in fact been attended by the majority of those present at today's meeting of the Section. The fact that every one of the recommendations now submitted had been unanimously adopted and had secured also the approval of the other members of the Congress who attended the meetings concerned was evidence of the wide support which those recommendations commanded.

In a complicated matter such as the consideration of a large number of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* to which the Section had now to address itself, it was essential that there should be no room for doubt as to the exact scope of the changes proposed. It was for this reason that a distribution had been made of the documents which had been before the Commission at the time when the proposals in question were under consideration. Additional copies of these documents were available for any member of the Section who wished to have a copy for his or her personal use.

The general programme of reform which the Commission hoped to see carried through by the present Congress was outlined in Commission Paper I.C.(48)1, and that part of it which was concerned with the amendment of the *Règles* was described in greater detail in Commission Paper I.C.(48)6. As would be seen from those papers, the Commission hoped that the Congress would agree (1) to incorporate, subject to certain exceptions and modifications, the

The recommendations of the Commission regarding the method to be adopted to give effect to the decisions of the Congress for the reform of the "Règles"

interpretations of the *Règles* given at various times in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission by the insertion in the *Règles* of express provisions dealing with the problems involved; (2) to make such changes in the *Règles* as were necessary either to remove ambiguities or to bring the *Règles* into line with the general wishes of zoologists; (3) to insert provisions embodying the substance of a number of important resolutions adopted by the Congress at various times (and since embodied by the Commission in *Declarations*); (4) to deal with various matters on which the *Règles* were at present silent; (5) to substitute *Recommandations* for mandatory provisions in certain cases; (6) to remove inconsistencies of phraseology which at present marred the *Règles* in various ways. The Commission were of the opinion—which they were confident would be shared by the Section—that the proper course for the Congress would be to concentrate upon taking clear-cut and unambiguous decisions on the questions at issue without attempting to draft the actual provisions which, in order to give effect to their decisions, would need to be inserted in the substantive French text of the *Règles*. Quite apart from the language problem inherent in drafting provisions in one language (French) on the basis of decisions taken in a different language (English), the task of drafting provisions of this sort involved a technical skill and experience inevitably lacked by zoologists. The Commission recommended therefore that this task should be deferred until after the close of the Congress when it should be entrusted to expert jurists. The jurists should be asked also to fill in certain gaps in the substantive French text where at present there was only an English text, and also to prepare a literal English translation of the *Règles* as revised. It was proposed that, when the jurists had prepared a draft French text to give effect to the decisions reached by the Congress, the text so prepared, together with the English translation, should be subject to a close scrutiny to ensure that the wording employed was appropriate from the zoological point of view and to make certain that the text proposed gave effect to the whole of the decisions reached by the Congress but contained no other provisions varying the meaning of the existing *Règles*. The Commission recommended that the duty of undertaking this scrutiny should be entrusted to the Executive Committee of the Commission. Finally it was proposed that, when this scrutiny had been completed and any necessary consequential changes made in the text, the Secretary to the Commission should arrange with the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature (the Corporation which, as the Section would recall, was now responsible for the manage-

(For a later decision modifying this proposal, see Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Minute 9)

ment of the business affairs of the Commission) for the publication of the revised *Règles* at the earliest possible moment and that those *Règles* should enter into effect immediately upon being so promulgated. The price to be charged for the revised edition of the *Règles* would be set at the lowest possible level.

The papers relating to the proposed amendment of the *Règles* which had so far been studied by the Commission in conjunction with the members of the Congress who had attended the meetings concerned were Papers I.C.(48)1 and 5 to 14. Of these, Paper I.C.(48)5, which was concerned with the meaning of the expression "nomenclature binaire" as used in the *Règles*, had already been considered by the Section, by whom the recommendations there submitted had been approved. As regards Papers I.C.(48)1 and 6, he (the President) had just put before the Section the recommendations of a general character there submitted. He accordingly now proposed to report to the Section the recommendations submitted by the Commission on the basis of their consideration of the remaining Papers (Papers I.C.(48)7 to 14), together with certain recommendations on particular points which had been adopted by the Commission in the course of their consideration of Paper I.C.(48)6. The recommendations so submitted fell into five groups, with each of which he would deal separately.

(a) The first subject to be considered was the recommendation of the Commission in regard to the meaning of the expression "indication" as used in relation to generic names in Article 25 of the *Règles*. This problem was discussed in detail in Paper I.C.(48)7. Over 40 years ago (in *Opinion* 1) the Commission had given a ruling that a generic name published without explanatory matter, without a designated or indicated type but containing two or more previously published nominal species, was not to be regarded as having been published with an "indication". This ruling had been almost completely overlooked and it was evident from a comprehensive inquiry undertaken by the Joint Committee on Zoological Nomenclature in Paleontology in America, the results of which had been submitted to the Commission, that an insistence on the interpretation of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 1 would clearly run counter to the wishes of the great majority of workers and that, if this provision were now to be applied, it would lead to widespread confusion in nomenclature through the pointless changes to which such a course would lead. The Commission accordingly proposed that it should be made clear in the *Règles* that a generic name published

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
1st Meeting,
Minute 6)

Meaning of the
expression
"indication" as
used in relation to
generic names in
Article 25

prior to 1st January, 1931, in the circumstances described above should be accepted as having been published with an "indication". At the same time the Commission proposed to cancel the relevant portion of *Opinion* 1.

Proposed establishment of rules for the naming of infra-specific forms.

(b) The second subject on which the Commission desired to submit proposals to the Congress was the nomenclature of categories of less than specific rank. Already as far back as 1932 the International Congress of Entomology had submitted a recommendation on this subject to the Congress. Unfortunately, the Commission had not been able in the three ensuing years to consider this question with sufficient care to enable them at their meeting held in Lisbon in 1935 to submit recommendations to the Congress for the clarification of the *Règles* in this matter. On that occasion the Commission had however requested their Secretary to consult with specialists with a view to the submission by him of a Report, with proposals for the issue by the Commission of an *Opinion* setting out the law in this matter. In accordance with this request, the Secretary had submitted the Report which had been distributed as Paper I.C.(48)9. It was to be regretted that sixteen years should have elapsed before the submission to the Congress of concrete proposals on this subject, but it was satisfactory to be able to note that the present scheme had been unanimously adopted by the Commission and had secured also the approval of the other members of the Congress who had attended the meetings of the Commission at which this subject had been discussed. As regards the form of the action now proposed to be taken, it would be recalled that during the present Session the Commission had made it clear that they were opposed to the growth of a body of case law outside the *Règles*. The Commission proposed therefore that this matter should be dealt with by way of the insertion of substantive provisions in the *Règles* and not, as they had contemplated at Lisbon in 1935, by way of an *Opinion*.

The Report submitted (Paper I.C.(48)9) contained an account of the history of this problem, a description of the attitude taken by different groups of zoologists and an analysis of the problems involved, together with proposals for their solution. While it was true that it was not until 1932 that this question had been brought expressly to the attention of the Commission, it was a matter both for surprise and for regret that it had not been raised at a much earlier date, for the difficulty involved was due to an inherent defect in the *Règles* as adopted at Berlin nearly fifty years ago. This difficulty arose from the fact that the *Règles* recognised only one taxonomic category below the species level, while zoologists recognised many

such categories ranging from subspecies based upon variations characteristic of whole populations through minority elements of many kinds down to individual aberrations. Some zoologists interpreted the expression "subspecies" as used in the *Règles* in the normal sense of a population within a given species differentiated by certain characters from other subspecies of that species. Such zoologists regarded other infra-specific forms as falling outside the scope of the *Règles*. Other zoologists regarded the expression "subspecies" as covering for this purpose all categories below the species level. Hence, wide divergences of practice had arisen and no uniformity could be achieved until the *Règles* themselves were amended so as to recognise two different classes of infra-specific form: (a) the subspecies in the conventional taxonomic sense of a population, and (b) all other subspecific forms, *i.e.* all infra-subspecific forms.

The question which the Commission had had to consider was the status to be given to names published for units of the infra-subspecific class. Here a certain divergence of interest existed, a divergence dependent on the scope of the work of the zoologists concerned. In the first place there were all those zoologists who were concerned with the study of categories down to, and including, the subspecies level but no further. For these zoologists the unqualified grant of rights under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy to names given to minority elements as contrasted with whole populations would constitute a severe handicap, for it would make it necessary for these workers to burden themselves with recording the many thousands of names published for minority elements, for this would be unavoidable if within any given genus such a name might render a name given to a new species or subspecies invalid by reason of its being a homonym of a name previously published for a minority element of some species belonging to the same genus. Such workers were therefore opposed to the unrestricted grant of nomenclatorial status to names published for forms below the subspecies level. On the other hand, there were those zoologists who were interested in the study of infra-subspecific forms, whose work would be gravely embarrassed if there were no provisions in the *Règles* which would ensure that every such form should always be known by the same name (Law of Priority) and that no name should be employed for more than one form within the same genus (Law of Homonymy). Finally, there was a third group which included many workers in the applied fields (*e.g.* economic entomologists), who demanded that means should be found, through appropriate modifications of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy,

to secure that parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species should bear the same name.

The scheme now submitted proposed that these different needs should be met by the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions under which the Laws of Priority and Homonymy should apply both to the names of species and subspecies and also to the names of infra-subspecific forms, but that these Laws should operate independently for each of these two groups. Under this system those zoologists whose work was not concerned with forms below the subspecies level would not need to take any account of names published for infra-subspecific forms, while the needs of those zoologists who on the contrary were interested to secure that names given to forms of this kind should be protected under the Laws of Priority and Homonymy would be met in full. It was an essential part of this scheme that the *Règles* should contain provisions defining for nomenclatorial purposes (1) a name given to a "subspecies" and (2) a name given to an "infra-subspecific form" and that an objective test should be provided to enable zoologists to determine to which of these categories any given name belonged. The test proposed was the evidence provided by the description or other data given in the publication in which the name in question first appeared. In order to ensure the maximum degree of stability for current practice, it was proposed that, in the case of names published prior to the introduction of the scheme (which it was proposed should be as from 1st January, 1951), a less rigorous standard should be applied for determining whether a given name had been proposed for a "subspecies" rather than for an "infra-subspecific form" but that a more rigorous standard should be required in the case of names published after that date. The scheme also contained provisions which would enable a name originally published as the name of a "species" or "subspecies" to take rank as the name of an "infra-subspecific" form when on taxonomic grounds it was considered necessary to treat the form so named as being an "infra-subspecific" form, and which enabled a name originally published as the name of an "infra-subspecific" form to be promoted to be the name of a subspecies (or species) when such promotion was judged to be necessary on taxonomic grounds. In the latter case it was essential that for the purposes of the Laws of Priority and Homonymy the name should rank as the name of a "subspecies" only as from the date on which it was elevated to that category, for otherwise it would still be necessary for workers interested only in the study of categories down to and including the subspecies level to keep a complete record of all names published for "infra-subspecific" forms. It was

PURCHASED

14 JUL 1950



THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume is devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948*. Parts 1-21 have already been published and the remaining Parts, containing the subject index, are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume has been devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948*, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature. Parts 1-6 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL PURCHASED NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

	Page
PART 1. <i>The Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in July, 1948: Concluding portion of Minutes of the Second Meeting and Minutes of the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Meetings</i>	63-128
PART 2. <i>Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Final Plenary Session held in Paris on 27th July, 1948: Extracts relating to zoological nomenclature...</i> ...	131
PART 3. <i>Reports submitted by the Section on Nomenclature and by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its Final Plenary Session held in Paris on 27th July, 1948 (first instalment)</i> ...	135-168

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)

important that changes in the status of names as between the categories of "subspecific" and "infra-subspecific" name should be recognised as easily, and recorded as quickly, as possible after they had been effected and for this reason it was proposed that *Recommendations* should be inserted in the *Règles* to deal with these aspects of the problem. The scheme now submitted contained also proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions setting out the ideal procedure to be followed by authors when either publishing or subsequently citing names of either category. Finally, the scheme included a proposal that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision giving power to the International Commission, subject to certain conditions, to prescribe technical designations to denote parallel infra-subspecific forms occurring in two or more allied species or genera, such designations to be used in preference to any previously published names for the forms in question and to invalidate the use in the genus or genera concerned of the technical designation as a name for any other form. The acceptance of the scheme suggested would call for a reconsideration of the text of Article 2, for, where an infra-subspecific form was attached to a sub-species, a quadrinomial system of nomenclature would be involved.

The plan outlined above would, the Commission believed, provide a workable solution for the complex problem presented by the nomenclature of forms below the species level and one which would meet the, in part, inconsistent, requirements of each of the principal groups of zoologists interested in this matter, while inflicting the minimum amount of inconvenience upon any of these groups. As such, therefore, the Commission warmly commended this scheme to the favourable consideration of the Section and the Congress.

(c) The third question on which the Commission desired to submit recommendations to the Section and the Congress was concerned with the Law of Homonymy in relation to the names of species and subspecies (and, if the Congress accepted the Commission's proposals in regard to the establishment for nomenclatorial purposes of the category "infra-subspecific form", in relation also to the names of such forms). The issues involved, which were highly complex, were discussed in Commission Paper I.C.(48)8. In the case of this matter, there were considerable differences in the current practice of zoologists, and complete agreement as to the best solution to be adopted could not readily be achieved. The paper to which reference had been made accordingly discussed the relative advantages of each of the principal solutions which had been

*The Law of
Homonymy in
relation to the
names of species,
subspecies, and
infra-subspecific
forms*

advocated, in order thereby to clear the ground for a decision as to the solution which possessed the greatest number of advantages while at the same time offering the smallest number of disadvantages.

The problem of specific homonymy was at present dealt with in Articles 35 and 36 of the *Règles*. These Articles were defective, for they were not only marred by very serious omissions but contained also—or were interpreted as containing—a serious ambiguity on one matter of crucial importance, namely, whether a name rejected as a secondary homonym was to be regarded as having been permanently invalidated as the result of such rejection or whether it should be restored when the state of homonymy (on account of which it had been rejected) ceased to exist. In addition, these Articles suffered from a confusion between subjective taxonomic considerations and objective nomenclatorial fact. Moreover, the wording of these Articles was rendered unnecessarily obscure by the use of the expression “specific name” when what was intended was the “trivial name” of a species (the *nomen triviale* of Linnaeus).

Each of the five principal proposals which had been put forward for dealing with this problem was discussed in turn in Paper I.C.(48)8. Of these proposals, the first three were clearly less satisfactory than either the fourth or the fifth. Under both the two last-named proposals a name would need to be replaced as a secondary homonym only if at the time of replacement it was considered (on taxonomic grounds) that a condition of homonymy still existed. Names so replaced would be permanently invalidated. As regards primary homonyms, the fourth proposal contemplated that the procedure should be the same as for secondary homonyms, while under the fifth proposal the junior of every pair of primary homonyms would need to be replaced whenever detected, such replacement being permanent. The fourth proposal had the advantage that it would avoid the necessity for the replacement of primary homonyms in those cases where, according to current taxonomic ideas, the two species concerned were not congeneric. The fifth proposal, on the other hand, had the merit that it recognised the need for securing that every species should have as its original name a name consisting of a binominal combination which within the genus concerned was and always had been exclusively its own. The fifth proposal moreover corresponded with the current general practice of zoologists. On balance, therefore, the Commission considered that the fifth proposal was to be preferred to the fourth and they accordingly recommended its acceptance. The Commission proposed that provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* to

deal separately (a) with names rejected as secondary homonyms prior to the introduction of the revised Articles which they suggested should come into operation as from 1st January, 1951, and (b) with names similarly rejected after that date. The new scheme would apply in its entirety to the latter class of name, but, in the case of names falling in the first of these two classes, a name rejected as a secondary homonym was to be regarded as having been permanently rejected, even if, had the new scheme applied in that case, that rejection would have been incorrect and therefore invalid. This provision, like the corresponding provision included in the scheme for the regulation of names of forms of less than specific rank, had for its object the ensuring of the minimum interference with existing nomenclatorial practice.

In addition to the principal provisions just described, the scheme contained a number of other provisions which were, in the opinion of the Commission, necessary to, or consequential upon, the comprehensive reform of Articles 35 and 36 of the *Règles*. These provisions included: (1) the substitution (here and elsewhere in the *Règles*, where the context so required) of the expressions "specific trivial name" and "subspecific trivial name" for the expressions "specific name" and "subspecific name" and the definition of those expressions; (2) the definition of the expressions "homonym", "primary homonym" and "secondary homonym"; (3) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging authors, on detecting and replacing invalid names, to notify their action to a literature-recording serial such as the "Zoological Record"; (4) the application to subspecific names and subspecific trivial names of the provisions relating to specific names and specific trivial names, subject to a saving clause in favour of the subspecific trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more named subspecies; (5) a provision requiring the Commission to use its plenary powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes any book or paper in which, in their opinion, the provisions of the *Règles* relating to the replacement of secondary homonyms had been misused by an irresponsible or malicious author for the deliberate purpose of creating secondary homonyms or for providing opportunities for publishing new names or both; (6) a provision that subgeneric names were to be disregarded in determining whether a condition of specific or subspecific homonymy exists; (7) the deletion from the third paragraph of Article 35 of the words "of the same origin and meaning", experience having shown that those words (the interpretation of which required a specialised knowledge

*For a later decision
on the question here
discussed, see Paris
Session, 4th
Meeting, Minute 6)*

of the origin of words in Latin and other languages not possessed by the majority of zoologists) served to make the provision in question virtually unworkable. The Commission recommended also, though with some hesitation, that the rules applying to specific and subspecific homonymy should apply to cases where a condition of apparent specific or subspecific homonymy arose not as between two species placed in a single genus but as between species placed in different genera, which, through the accident of an undetected condition of generic homonymy, bore the same name.

In the course of their discussion of the foregoing problem, the Commission had agreed upon certain other recommendations which they desired to submit to the Section and the Congress. These recommendations were concerned to secure: (1) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging authors to secure publicity for new family and sub-family names, for new specific and subspecific names, and for the names of new infra-subspecific forms, for the elevation of names given to infra-subspecific forms to be the trivial names of subspecies or species and also for the selection of the type species of genera (under Article 30), by communicating copies of papers containing such new names or such type selections to a literature-recording serial such as the "Zoological Record"; (2) the insertion of a provision requiring that, in order to come within the scope of Article 25, every new specific or subspecific name must be published in connection with a generic name; (3) the co-ordination of the Law of Priority (Article 25) and the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34-36); (4) the application to Article 34 (relating to generic homonymy) of the amendment recommended to be made in the third paragraph of Article 35 (relating to specific homonymy), *i.e.* the recommendation in favour of the deletion of the words "of the same origin and meaning".

The Commission considered that it was too much to hope that any single revision of the Law of Homonymy could be completely satisfactory and they fully expected that, if their present recommendations were approved, experience in the operation of the new provisions would suggest directions in which further improvements could be effected. Nevertheless, the present scheme represented, in the opinion of the Commission, an immense improvement upon the totally inadequate provisions of the present Articles 35 and 36. The Commission therefore commended the present scheme to the favourable consideration of the Section and the Congress.

Codification of the interpretations of the "Règles" given by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in "Opinions" and of the resolutions incorporated in the Commission's "Declarations"

(d) The fourth matter concerned the reform of the *Règles* on which the Commission desired to submit recommendations to the Section, and the Congress was concerned with the incorporation in the *Règles* (a) of interpretations of the *Règles* given by the Commission at different times in *Opinions* rendered in their judicial capacity and (b) of the substance of a number of important resolutions adopted by the Commission or the Congress on different occasions and subsequently incorporated by the Commission in *Declarations*. The nature of the recommendations now submitted would be found in Commission Papers I.C.(48)10, 11 and 13.

The Articles in the *Règles* into which additional provisions would be inserted on the acceptance of the proposed codification were Article 4 (*Opinion* 141), Article 8 (*Opinion* 183), Article 14 (*Opinion* 64), Article 19 (*Opinions* 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 60, 63, 69), Article 25 (*Opinions* 1, 2, 4, 5, 43, 49, 52, 59, 87, 88, 145, 191), Article 26 (*Opinion* 3), Article 30 (*Opinions* 6, 7, 10, 14, 16, 18, 35, 46, 47, 62, 65, 88, 148, 164, 168, 172), Article 34 (*Opinions* 25, 102, 125, 145, 147, 148), Article 35 (*Opinions* 102, 145, 148). Full particulars of the nature and extent of the codification proposed in respect of the interpretation of these Articles in *Opinions* rendered by the Commission would be found in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11. In the course of the examination of the recommendations put forward in that paper, the Commission had come to the conclusion that in two cases the existing provisions in the *Règles* were unsatisfactory and required amendment. The Articles concerned were Articles 4 and 5 relating to the formation of the names of families and sub-families, and Article 19 relating to the emendation of names where those names were mis-spelt on being first published. In each case the issues involved were complex and required much more detailed consideration than had as yet been given to them. Following the precedent set at the Lisbon Congress in 1935 in connection with the nomenclature of forms of less than specific rank, the Commission had invited the Secretary to the Commission to make a detailed study, in consultation with interested specialists, of the issues involved in each of these problems, and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at the next meeting of the Congress. The Commission had agreed that, on the acceptance of the proposals now submitted, (a) the *Opinions* containing the interpretations now codified, in whole or in part, and (b) in the case of *Opinions* which contained both interpretations of the *Règles* and also decisions relating to particular names, the interpretative portions of the *Opinions* concerned should be repealed for interpretative purposes. The *Opinions* falling in the first

of these classes were *Opinions* 1-7, 10, 35, 46, 62, 64, 65, 87, 141, 145, 147, 148, 164, 168, 172, 183, 191. The *Opinions* falling in the second of the foregoing classes were *Opinions* 14, 16, 18, 25-27, 29, 36, 41, 43, 47, 49, 52, 59-61, 63, 88, 102, 125.

The Commission believed that the recommendations now submitted covered all the interpretative *Opinions* so far rendered, but if any zoologist considered that an interpretation of a provision in the *Règles* had been given in any *Opinion* other than those specified above, the Commission would be glad to be furnished with particulars so that they might consider the matter before the next meeting of the Congress. The view of the Commission was that every interpretation of the *Règles* given in an *Opinion* already published should either be incorporated in the *Règles* or be withdrawn and that the *Opinion* in question should be repealed or cancelled immediately a decision was taken in one or other of the foregoing senses. As regards the future, the Commission proposed that the series of *Declarations* should be reserved for interpretations of provisions of the *Règles*, that such interpretations should become effective immediately upon publication, and that every *Declaration* so rendered should in addition contain a proposal for the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision giving effect to the interpretation there given. The Commission further proposed that every such *Declaration* rendered during an inter-Congress period should be brought to the attention of the Congress at its next meeting with a recommendation that the proposal set forth therein be approved and adopted. These proposals would be found set out in detail in Commission Paper I.C.(48)10.

Turning to the *Declarations* already rendered by the Commission, the Section would find that they had already agreed to recommend the incorporation in the *Règles* of one (*Declaration* 5), which recorded the grant to the Commission of plenary powers to suspend the *Règles* in certain circumstances and that two others (*Declarations* 9 and 10) dealt with subjects which, though of great importance, were not suitable for incorporation in the *Règles*. As would be seen from Commission Paper I.C.(48)13, the Commission proposed that the substance of the remaining *Declarations* (namely, *Declarations* 1-4, 6-8, 11 and 12) should now be incorporated in the *Règles* and, with *Declaration* 5, thereupon be repealed. The Commission recommended also the insertion in the *Règles* of *Recommandations* urging authors publishing new names for any taxonomic category clearly to indicate that the name was new and to cite that name in a specified manner.

*Miscellaneous
proposals for the
amendment of the
"Règles"*

(e) The fifth of the items to be considered consisted of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* in various respects. Most of these proposals were designed to supply the answers to questions not at present dealt with in the *Règles* or to remove ambiguities in the wording of existing provisions. The bulk of these proposals were explained in detail in Commission Papers I.C.(48)12, I.C.(48)14, and I.C.(48)15, but in addition a certain number of similar recommendations had been agreed upon by the Commission in the course of their discussion of Commission Papers I.C.(48)6 and I.C.(48)11. He (the President) proposed to deal in turn with the recommendations falling in each of these groups.

*Recommendations
arising out of the
consideration of
Commission Paper
I.C. (48) 6*

In the course of their consideration of Paper I.C.(48)6, the Commission had agreed to submit recommendations designed: (1) to make it clear that names published in contravention of Articles 11-16, 18 and 20 were automatically to be corrected by later authors so as to make them comply with the requirements of the foregoing Articles, Article 19 not being concerned with corrections falling within these classes, and that names corrected to comply with Articles 11-16, 18 and 20 and names emended under Article 19 rank for purposes of priority from their original date of publication and are to be attributed to their original author, it being at the same time agreed that the Commission's *Opinion* 8 (the interpretation in which was incorrect) should be cancelled; (2) to eliminate the ritualistic provisions involved in the use in Article 25 of the expressions "definite bibliographic reference," and "definite unambiguous designation of the type species" and the requirement that all descriptions of new systematic units must contain comparisons with previously described units, but at the same time to indicate by means of *Recommendations* inserted in Article 25 the ideal method to be followed by authors in these matters, it being agreed at the same time that the Commission's *Opinion* 138 (which would thus cease to be applicable) should be cancelled; (3) to make it clear that the provisions in the Second Schedule (hitherto known as the *Appendice*) were not mandatory in character; (4) to redraft Article 31 to make it clear that it referred to nomenclature and not to taxonomy and, by eliminating the reference to Article 30, to give clear directions as to the action to be taken to determine the identity of a composite nominal species; (5) to insert a reference to the category "subgenus" in Article 2, from which it had inadvertently been omitted; (6) to redraft the *Recommendation* to Article 29 and to transfer it to Article 25.

*Recommendations
arising out of the
consideration of
Paper I.C. (48) 11*

The discussion on Commission Paper I.C.(48)11 had given rise to the following recommendations ; (1) to make it clear that, where a new specific trivial name was published in a list of species or subspecies and was there preceded by a serial letter or numeral, that serial letter or numeral was not to be taken as constituting part of the specific trivial name in question ; (2) to make it clear both as regards generic names and as regards specific and subspecific trivial names that the list of differences in spelling which were to be ignored in determining whether a given name was a homonym of another name specified, in the first case, in Article 34 and, in the second case, in Article 35 was in each case an exhaustive list and that in consequence a name which differed from another name in spelling in any other way was not to be rejected as a homonym of that name ; (3) to make it clear in the third paragraph of Article 35 that, where a specific or subspecific trivial name was an adjective and differed from another such trivial name only in termination and that difference was due to a difference in the gender in which the adjective was cited, the two trivial names were to be treated as homonyms of one another ; (4) to insert in the *Règles Recommendations* urging authors (i) not to select as generic names words already used as names of orders or higher categories and (ii) not to publish names conditionally.

*Recommendations
arising out of the
consideration of
Paper I.C.(48)12*

Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 contained twenty recommendations for the amendment of the *Règles*. These were concerned with : (1) the insertion in Article 8 of a *Recommendation* urging the selection of short and euphonious words as generic names ; (2) the redrafting of Article 13 to eliminate the existing option to use a capital initial letter in citing certain specific and subspecific trivial names ; (3) the insertion of a provision in Article 14 containing a *Recommendation* in relation to specific and subspecific trivial names similar to that proposed in (1) above in relation to generic names ; (4) the substitution of examples drawn from binominal authors for examples drawn from non-binominal authors, wherever such occurred in the *Règles* ; (5) the deletion of the existing *Recommendation* in Article 22 and the insertion of a new *Recommendation* deprecating the abbreviation of the names of authors, except in certain specified cases ; (6) the insertion in Article 25 of words to secure that apparent new names (generic or trivial) or new combinations due to errors in literature-recording serials should have no status in nomenclature ; (7) the clarification of the meaning of the expression " les principes de la

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
1st Meeting,
Minute 6)

nomenclature binominale" as used in the amended text of Article 25 already agreed upon by the Section; (8) the restriction of certain portions of Article 30 to names published before 1st January, 1931; (9) various verbal amendments in Article 30 to make it clear that that Article was concerned not with taxonomy but with nomenclature; (10) amendments in the same and other Articles to correct errors due to imperfect drafting; (11) the clarification of Rule (g) in Article 30; (12) the clarification of the meaning of Article 31; (13) the insertion in Article 35 of a provision applying to trivial names the provisions already recommended to be inserted in Article 34 in relation to generic names by the incorporation therein of the interpretation given in the Commission's *Opinion* 148; (14) the introduction of a provision recognising and defining the expressions "holotype," "syntype," and "lectotype," of *Recommandations* regarding the description and marking of types and their deposit in public institutions where their safe preservation could be reasonably assured, the avoidance of the expression co-type, the insertion of a declaratory Article declaring that types are the property of Science, and the deletion of the provisions relating to types in the *Appendice*; (15) the introduction of a provision prescribing the trivial name to be applied to the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more named subspecies; (16) the problem of neotypes; (17) the insertion of a provision to prevent the misuse of the *Règles* for the purpose of giving political, religious or personal offence; (18) to (20) proposals designed to remove unnecessary obscurities, verbal inconsistencies and meaningless repetitions from the *Règles*. In the case of the question whether the category "neotype" should be recognised in the *Règles*, the Commission considered that further examination in conjunction with specialists was desirable and they had invited the Secretary to the Commission to undertake such an inquiry and to submit a Report, with recommendations, for consideration at the next meeting of the Congress. The Commission recommended the adoption of the recommendations submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, subject only to certain minor modifications. In the course of their consideration of this paper, the Commission had agreed also to recommend that, throughout the *Règles*, the expressions "nominal genus" and "nominal species" should be substituted for the expressions "genus" and "species," wherever the provision in question referred not to a genus or to a species in the taxonomic sense but to the concept represented by a given generic name or specific name, as the case might be.

*Recommendations
arising out of the
consideration of
Paper I.C.(48)14*

The next group of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* were those dealt with in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14. The twelve proposals in this paper were numbered consecutively with those in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. The field covered by these proposals included :—(21) the addition of words to Article 8 to provide for the case where a new generic name consisting of a Latinised word of another language was published as though it was a noun in the nominative singular, whereas in its original language it was in some number or case other than the singular or the nominative ; (22) the addition to Article 14 of a *Recommandation* urging authors not to select as trivial names words already in use in allied groups ; (23) the deletion from Article 15 of the permissive provisions in regard to the use of hyphens, subject to certain exceptions, and the clarification of that Article in certain respects ; (24) the insertion in Article 18 of four amendments designed to clarify the meaning ; (25) the insertion of a provision regulating the status of names published anonymously or over initials only ; (26) the clarification of the meaning of the expression “divulgué dans une publication” as used in Article 25, the insertion of a *Recommandation* in regard thereto, and the repeal of *Opinions* 15 and 51 for interpretative purposes ; (27) the clarification of the status of names first published in abstracts ; (28) the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* regarding the publication of new names in a work consisting of keys ; (29) the criteria to be adopted in determining the date of publication of a given work and the method of citing such dates ; (30) the priority to be accorded to new names when published in a work appearing in parts where a portion of the description was included at the end of one part and the remainder in the beginning of the next part ; (31) the status of trivial names published after 31st December, 1930, in binominal combinations in which the generic names used did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 ; (32) the proposed addition to the Second Schedule (formerly the *Appendice*) of a section indicating the manner in which names derived from words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet. The Commission had approved the recommendations submitted on the above matters, subject only to minor amendments and accordingly now commended them to the Section and the Congress for approval. When considering this paper the Commission had considered also certain proposals for the clarification of Article 14 submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet. These proposals, which had as their object the validation of current practice, were commended by the Commission to the favourable consideration of the Section. Certain

other somewhat similar proposals, of which the most important related to the formation of compound trivial names, also submitted by Professor Bonnet, had been deferred for further consideration after the close of the Congress. In addition, while examining the proposals in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14, the Commission had decided to submit two further recommendations, of which the first was concerned with certain minor amplifications in Article 15, while the second related to the orthography of names, the first portion of which consisted of a numeral.

*Recommendations
arising out of
the consideration of
Paper I.C.(48)15*

The last group of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* which the Commission wished to submit to the Section at its present meeting were those dealt with in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. These proposals, thirty-one in number, were numbered consecutively with those in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14, and appeared therefore as proposals (33) to (63). The subjects dealt with in these proposals were:—(33) the need for the adaptation of Article 27 to meet the nomenclatorial requirements of polymorphic Protozoa; (34) the status of certain very similar names for the purpose of Article 35; (35) the position where under Article 4 two families had identical names; (36) the procedure to be followed on the union on taxonomic grounds of two families; (37) the need for defining the expression Latin in Article 3 and for removing ambiguities from Article 5 arising from the ill-advised use of the technical expression "radical"; (38) the method to be followed to secure the agreement of adjectival trivial names in gender with the generic names with which they were combined; (39) the insertion in a Schedule of a section on the gender of Latin nouns and of Greek nouns Latinised on being used as generic names and on the differences in the terminations of the nominative singular of adjectives according to the gender used (as a guide in the citation of adjectival trivial names); (40) the point of time as from which the Proviso (c) added to Article 25 at Budapest became operative; (41) the insertion of a correction in paragraph 16 in Section "G" of the Second Schedule; (42) the status of trivial names consisting of unchanged modern patronymics; (43) the status of trivial names consisting of arbitrary combinations of letters and consolidation into Article 8 of the present *Recommendations*; (44) the use of parentheses (in English usually called "round brackets") where subgeneric names are used as well as generic names; (45) the question whether a description of the work of an animal constitutes an "indication"; (46) the status of generic names based

upon figures only ; (47) the authorship and date for priority of names published conditionally ; (48) the question whether the citation of a host species without any other descriptive matter constitutes an "indication" for a parasitic species and parallel problem where, in the case of a fossil species, only the geological horizon is cited ; (49) the meaning of the expression "le plus anciennement designé" as used in Article 25 ; (50) the action to be taken on proposals submitted for the deletion of Articles 22 and 23 of the *Règles* ; (51) the authorship of a name which, when first validly published, was already a manuscript name or a *nomen nudum* ; (52) the clarification of Rule (g) in Article 30 ; (53) the title of the *Règles* as now proposed to be amended ; (54) the establishment of Schedules for recording decisions taken regarding the availability of individual names or classes of name ; (55) the use of names ending in "-idae" or "-inae" for purposes other than that of the names for families or subfamilies ; (56) and (57) the need for drafting amendments in Articles 12 and 7 ; (58) the co-ordination of the wording used in Articles 6 and 11 ; (59) the elimination of an illogicality and of an error in Section (b) of the second *Recommandation* to Article 8 ; (60) the conversion into a mandatory provision of the decision taken at Padua in 1930 which at present appears quite inappropriately as a *Recommandation* to Article 36 ; (61) the extension to all works by Linnaeus and Fabricius (J.C.) of the interpretation of Article 25 given in the Commission's *Opinion* 124 ; (62) the status of names placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" ; (63) the establishment for the trivial names of species of an "Official List" similar to that already established for generic names. The Commission had adopted recommendations on the basis of the foregoing proposals and now submitted these for the approval of the Section. During their discussion of these proposals the Commission had agreed also to recommend (1) the co-ordination of Article 1 and Articles 34 and 35 and the co-ordination also of Articles 19 and 32 and (2) the insertion of a *Recommandation* urging the avoidance of the publication of a name differing from a previously published name only through having, as its stressed syllable, the syllable "an" or "en", as the case may be ; (3) the insertion of a *Recommandation* condemning the publication of names suggesting a bizarre or otherwise objectionable meaning in some language other than Latin ; (4) the insertion of a provision that the citation of a geological horizon on the first publication of a name for a fossil species does not constitute an "indication" ; (5) the allocation to Articles 34 and 35 of the *Recommandations* at present attached to Article 36. Finally, the Commission had invited the

Secretary to prepare a review of the problem created by the provisions in Article 28 in relation to the "first reviser" and they hoped to be able to submit proposals thereon to the Section before the end of the present Congress. Of the proposals now submitted, those numbered (62) and (63), the Section would observe, went a little way in the direction of securing the greater stability in nomenclature advocated by the Section at its previous meeting. Further than this the Commission did not consider it desirable to go during the present Congress, although they recognised that it was the general wish of the members of the Section that this matter should be treated in a bolder and more comprehensive fashion. For the reasons explained at the meeting held on the previous day, the Commission thought it wise to provide an opportunity for the discussion of this problem before they proceeded further, for, as he (the President) had reminded the Section, there were zoologists not present at the Congress who were such firm believers in the efficacy of the Law of Priority that they were opposed to any concrete action being taken in other ways to promote stability in nomenclature.

Continuing, THE PRESIDENT said that the statement which he had just made placed the Section and, through the Section, the Congress in full possession of the conclusions reached and the recommendations agreed upon by the Commission during its present Session up to the end of its meeting held on the previous evening. The Commission invited the Section to approve its proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* in the directions which he had indicated and its recommendations as to the procedure to be adopted for preparing a text of the *Règles* revised in accordance with the decisions taken by the present Congress, for the checking of the text so prepared, for its promulgation as soon as possible after having been so checked, and for its immediate entry into force upon being so promulgated. The statement presented to the Section was inevitably condensed in form but the fact that it had been based on a series of papers, copies of which had been distributed, had, he felt confident, made it easy for the members of the Section to follow the proposals submitted by the Commission. Moreover, the majority of those attending the present meeting of the Section had attended some or all of the public meetings of the Commission at which those proposals had been drawn up. If, however, any member of the Section desired to be furnished with additional information on any of the proposals in question or to ask any questions in regard thereto, he (the President) would be very pleased to comply with a request so made.

After a motion had been proposed and seconded that the Section adopt a Resolution in the sense suggested by the President and after an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section to ask any question or to bring forward an amendment to the foregoing proposal, and no such amendment had been submitted, THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) put the motion to the Section by whom it was unanimously adopted.

**Third Meeting of
the Section on
Nomenclature :
date and time
appointed**

14. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had originally expected that it would be necessary to ask the Section to meet again that afternoon and perhaps also that evening. The discussion that had taken place both on the previous day and again at this morning's meeting had, however, been conducted by all concerned in so co-operative a spirit and with such a close attention to business that it would not be necessary for him to ask either the Section or the Commission to meet again before the week-end. The next meeting of the Section, which would be held concurrently with a meeting of the Commission, would be held at the same place on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 09.00 hours. At that meeting the draft of the Report to be submitted to the Congress would be laid before the Commission and the Section.

(The Section thereupon adjourned at 12.10 hours)

APPENDIX TO THE MINUTES OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE, THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, JULY, 1948, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE ZOOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA

- (a) Copy of a communication addressed by the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna and other Austrian Zoologists to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July, 1948

*(handed to the President of the Section on Nomenclature on the
opening day of the Congress)*

An den

Internationalen Kongress für Zoologie,
Paris.

Die österreichische Zoologenschaft erlaubt sich an den Kongress das folgende Ansuchen zu stellen :

Es ist eine von jedem Zoologen bitter empfundene Tatsache, dass sich die zoologische Nomenklatur der Gegenwart in einem Zustand bedauerlicher Unsicherheit und Verwirrung befindet. Immer wieder werden jahrhundertlang in einheitlichem Gebrauch gewesene Namen verworfen und durch unbekannte andere ersetzt, nicht aus sachlich systematisch-klassifikatorischen Gründen, sondern lediglich um einer leeren Schablonenforderung nach absoluter Priorität Genüge zu tun. In der ganzen Welt ist eine Gegenbewegung gegen diese stetige und völlig unnötige Bedrohung der Kontinuität der wissenschaftlichen Tierbenennung im Zuge; eine grundlegende Reform der Nomenklaturregeln ist unbedingt erforderlich. Eine solche Reform bedarf jedoch der wohl-vorbereiteten Mitarbeit und Zustimmung der gesamten Zoologenschaft der Erde. Keinesfalls darf sie überstürzt und einseitig nach dem Willen Einzelner durchgeführt werden, die sich in einer ohne diese Vorbereitungen zusammengestellten Kommission im Augenblicke in der Mehrheit befinden könnten.

Die wirklich den Willen der Zoologenschaft der Erde zum Ausdruck bringende Zusammenarbeit ist aber infolge der besonderen Verhältnisse der Nachkriegszeit gegenwärtig nicht erreichbar. Die Kriegshandlungen der jüngst verflossenen Zeitperiode haben den Verkehr der Zoologen der einzelnen Länder unterbunden; eine gegenseitige Verständigung über die Wünsche und Bedürfnisse der Gesamtheit war nicht möglich. Deshalb ist auch die Aufstellung einer Nomenklaturkommission, die das Mandat der Gesamtheit besitzt, zur Zeit nicht möglich. Da ausserdem manche Länder infolge der Nachkriegsnot nicht

imstande sind, eine zureichende Vertretung zu diesem ersten Kongress nach Kriegsende zu entsenden, besteht für diesen Kongress die ernste Gefahr einer nicht hinreichend vorbereiteten, voreiligen Beschlussfassung in nomenklatorischen Dingen, die in ihren weittragenden Folgen nicht nur die gesamte Zoologie, sondern auch alle mit Tiernamen irgendwie in Beziehung tretenden Wissensgebiete betreffen. Um einer solchen folgenschweren, voreiligen Beschlussfassung vorzubeugen, erlaubt sich die österreichische Zoologenschaft zunächst als Richtlinie den folgenden Grundsatz aufzustellen :

Jeder heute einheitlich gebrauchte, eingelebte wissenschaftliche Tiername ist ein unschätzbarer nomenklatorischer Wert, ein Verständigungsmittel, dessen Zerstörung den Zoologiebetrieb schwer schädigt. Bis zur endgültigen Regelung der Verhältnisse ist daher jede Aenderung eines einheitlich gebrauchten Namens zu unterlassen, wenn für die Aenderung nur formal-nomenklatorische (Prioritäts-) Gründe, aber keine systematischen Notwendigkeiten vorliegen.

Im Sinne dieses Grundsatzes wird der Kongress gebeten, dafür Sorge zu tragen, dass auf diesem Kongresse keine Beschlüsse gefasst werden, die die Nomenklaturregeln betreffen, und dass überhaupt nichts veranlasst werde, was dem obzitierten Grundsatz widerspricht und was geeignet wäre, eine weitere Verwirrung der nomenklatorischen Verhältnisse in der Zoologie zu bewirken. Die für eine gesunde Zukunft der zoologischen Nomenklatur unerlässlichen Reformbeschlüsse sollen späteren Kongressen vorbehalten bleiben, bei denen die wohlwogenen berechtigten Wünsche der Zoologenschaft der Erde vollständiger und klarer zum Ausdruck kommen können als dies auf diesem Kongress möglich wäre.

Prof. OTTO STORCH

Zoologisches Institut der
Universität Wien.

Vorstand des Zoologischen Institutes der
Universität Wien, kor. Mitglied der
österreich. Akademie der Wissenschaft.

Dr. KARL HOLDHAUS

Naturhistorisches Museums
Wien. Zoologische Abteilung.

Direktor Naturhistorischen Museums in
Wien.

U. STUNDRA

Zoologisch-Botanische
Gesellschaft.

Generalsekretär der Zoologisch-Botanischen
Gesellschaft in Wien.

(b) Copy of letter (Z.N.(G.)36), dated 29th July, 1948, from the President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, to the President of the Zoological Institute of the University of Vienna

Sehr geehrter Herr Professor !

I have the honour to inform you that the communication on the subject of zoological nomenclature addressed to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology jointly by yourself, by the Director of the Naturhistorische Museum in Vienna and by the Secretary-General of the Zoologisch-Botanischen Gesellschaft

of Vienna was duly communicated to me as President of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress. On receiving your communication I at once placed it before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

The Section on Nomenclature was in complete agreement with the convictions expressed in your communication of the urgent need for securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature and of avoiding, as far as possible, changes in established names undertaken for purely nomenclatorial reasons. This view was fully shared also by the International Commission. Both the Commission and the Section were in full accord with you and your colleagues that a fundamental reform of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* was necessary for this end.

Indeed, in response both to their own convictions and also to the widely-expressed views along these lines received from zoologists in all parts of the world, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had itself carefully prepared and formulated proposals for the consideration of the Congress for the amendment of the *Règles* with a view to securing uniformity and stability in zoological nomenclature.

While the Section on Nomenclature and the International Commission unanimously regretted that circumstances made it impossible for zoologists of certain countries to be present at the Congress which has just closed and to participate in its work, it was felt that the need for proceeding in the direction of greater stability was so urgent and the proposals submitted by the Commission for meeting this need commanded such general support that no further delay in undertaking the necessary and long-overdue reforms in the *Règles* would be justified.

Accordingly, the Congress agreed upon a number of amendments of the *Règles* designed to remove obscurities, to offer guidance on certain important matters not hitherto covered by the *Règles* and generally to bring the *Règles* into greater harmony with the practice and wishes of the general body of zoologists. The Congress further agreed to a general codification of the law in regard to zoological nomenclature through the incorporation into the *Règles* themselves of interpretations of particular Articles given in the past by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature acting in its judicial capacity, and the inclusion in Schedules to be attached to the *Règles* of decisions made by the Commission in individual cases.

Two important amendments were adopted which should go far towards procuring stability in nomenclature and which should therefore be particularly welcome to you and your colleagues in Austria. First, it was agreed that no name inserted in the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" should be discarded by zoologists on purely nomenclatorial grounds without the prior approval of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Second, it was agreed to establish an "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" with similar standing. The enhanced status of names placed on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" and the establishment of the "Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology" would, it was thought, encourage

specialists to assemble all the important generic names and specific trivial names in the groups in which they are interested and to assure stability for them by these means.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress feel confident that Austrian zoologists will welcome these changes, as also the other changes in the *Règles* which have been adopted at the meeting which has just closed. I am writing this letter in Paris on the eve of my return to London and it is my intention to forward to you for your information and that of your colleagues as soon as possible a set of the documents submitted to the Congress, which formed the basis of the reforms which have been agreed upon. Further, these documents, together with the detailed record of the decisions taken by the Commission and the Congress, will be published as soon as possible by the Commission in their *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*.

Other important reforms agreed upon during the Congress, on the recommendation of the Commission, were concerned to secure a more truly representative character to the Commission and to reform its procedure in order to enable decisions to be taken with greater rapidity. Under the first of these heads, it will be possible now to secure that zoologists in any country in which any considerable amount of zoological work is being done may be directly represented on the Commission, while, under the second of these heads, the Congress have approved a proposal abolishing the obsolete and undesirable *Liberum Veto* which in the past has constituted an unnecessary obstacle in the way of reform of the *Règles*.

It is the earnest hope and the confident belief of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that these reforms will be warmly welcomed by the zoologists of Austria. The Commission look forward also with pleasure to the early resumption of close and friendly co-operation between themselves and the zoologists of Austria. In particular, the Commission trust that at the next meeting of the International Congress of Zoology, to be held at Copenhagen in 1953, the zoologists of Austria and other countries not represented at the Congress which has just closed will be able to be present and thus be able once more to take the active part which they have always played in the Section on Nomenclature in promoting the development of zoological nomenclature on sound and progressive lines.

Hochachtungsvoll,

FRANCIS HEMMING

President of the Section on Nomenclature, Thirteenth
International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948.

THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

SECTION ON NOMENCLATURE

MINUTES of the Third Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre
Louis-Liard on Monday, 26th July, 1948, at 09.30 hours

(Meeting held concurrently with the Eleventh Meeting of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*President*)

Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)

Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)

M. André Chavan (France)

Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)

Dr. E. Hindle (United Kingdom)

Professor A. R. Jorge (Portugal)

Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)

Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Professor K. Mansour (Egypt)

Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)

Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)

Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)

Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)

Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)

Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

Signor Antonio Valle (Italy)

Mr. R. Winckworth (United Kingdom)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*

Apology by the
President for late
arrival

1. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING)
apologised for having kept the meeting waiting. The reason, as the Section appreciated, was that, although ever since the close of the meeting on Saturday he had been engaged continuously on work in connection with to-day's meetings of the Section and the Commission, he had only just completed the preparation of the necessary documents.

**Programme for the
Meetings to be held
during Monday,
26th July, 1948**

2. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) outlined the procedure which he proposed for the meetings to be held that day. Excellent progress had been made by the Section—as also by the International Commission—during the meetings held during the previous week. Nevertheless, there remained a large amount of work which it was essential should be dealt with during the limited time available before the close of the Congress. In the first place there was still a considerable number of proposals for the improvement of the *Règles* which would need to be considered first by the Commission and second by the Section to whom the recommendations of the Commission would be submitted for approval. Second, there were many proposals relating to individual problems of nomenclature which had been submitted to the Commission and on which it was most important that decisions should be taken during the present Session. This was important for two reasons: first, because many of the applicants concerned had expressed the liveliest hope that the present opportunity would not be missed for securing decisions on the cases which they had submitted, in some cases—owing to the war and other causes—a considerable number of years ago; second, it was important that the Commission should reach decisions on these cases in order to demonstrate to zoologists generally that they were capable of taking prompt action on cases which had been carefully prepared and properly submitted. In order to achieve this two-fold programme, it would be necessary for the Section and the Commission to devote to the purpose the whole of the present day and in addition probably to meet again in the evening after dinner. He (the President) did not doubt that members of the Section, as of the Commission, would gladly rise to their responsibilities in this matter.

Continuing, the President said that he proposed that all the meetings to be held during the course of the day should be concurrent meetings both of the Commission and of the Section. This procedure would enable the Commission to reach conclusions on the matters awaiting their attention in the presence of the members of the Section and, as he hoped, with the assistance and advice of any members of the Section who might desire to take part in these discussions. Under this procedure, recommendations adopted by the Commission should, he suggested, at once be reported to the Section for approval.

THE SECTION took note of the programme outlined by the President and approved the proposals which he had submitted in regard to the procedure to be adopted.

Election of
Professor K.
Mansour (Egypt)
to be an
Alternate Member
of the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

3. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he was pleased to be able to inform the Section that Professor K. Mansour (Egypt) had consented to act as an Alternate Member of the Commission during the remainder of its meetings during the present Session, *vice* Professor B. Hankó (Hungary).

THE SECTION took note of the statement just made by the President.

Withdrawal of
Professor R. Späreck
(Denmark) and
nomination of Dr. H.
Lemche as the
Danish Member
of the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

4. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that he had to report that, much to the regret of the Commission, Professor R. Späreck (Denmark) had intimated that on reflection he felt that pressure of his other duties, especially duties in connection with the next meeting of the Congress, would make it preferable that some other Danish zoologist should be nominated to be the Danish member of the Commission in succession to Dr. Th. Mortensen, whose resignation, on grounds of ill-health, had already been reported. Discussions on this question had accordingly been held between the Danish zoologists present at the Congress, who had recommended that the vacancy in the Commission so created should be filled by the election of Dr. Henning Lemche. This recommendation had been gladly accepted by the Commission, to whom Dr. Lemche was well known both as a correspondent and because of his active participation in the work of the Commission during its public meetings held during the present Session. The Commission felt confident that this nomination would be agreeable to the Section, to whom also Dr. Lemche was well known through the contributions to their discussions which he had made at their previous meetings. It was proposed also that Dr. Lemche should act as an Alternate Member of the Commission *vice* Professor J. R. Dymond.

THE SECTION took note of, and approved, the election of Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) to be a Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature as from the close of the present Congress in succession to Commissioner Th. Mortensen (Denmark) in place of Professor R. Späreck (Denmark) who had previously been nominated as Dr. Mortensen's successor but who now asked to be excused from service on the Commission in view of great pressure of other work. The Section took note also that Dr. Lemche had been elected to be an Alternate Member of the Commission in place of Professor J. R. Dymond for the duration of the present Congress.

Report to the
Congress submitted
by the
International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

5. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that in accordance with custom the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature would need to submit a Report on their work during their present Session for submission to the Congress. It had been ascertained that at the present, as at previous meetings of the Congress, the proceedings on the Reports of the Section and the Commission to be made at the final *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following morning would be purely formal, the entire recommendations of the Section and the Commission being put to the Congress *en bloc*, no discussion on individual points being permitted. In these circumstances and because of the extreme difficulties under which within a very few hours the Secretary to the Commission had had to prepare the draft of the Report of the Commission, it had been considered preferable to concentrate in that document upon drawing attention to the major reforms in the *Règles* and in the composition and procedure of the Commission which were recommended, while referring only in general terms to the large number of minor improvements which it was proposed should be introduced into the *Règles* when a revised text was prepared to give effect to the decisions reached by the Section on Nomenclature. This was a commonsense arrangement which he (the President) was confident would commend itself to the Commission and the Section and secure their approval, it being known already that it met with the approval of the authorities of the Congress.

Continuing, the President said that, although the number of copies of the draft of the Commission's Report (Commission Paper I.C.(48)20) was limited, there were sufficient copies to enable every member of the Section, by sharing copies with one another, to study the text of the Report before it was discussed by the Section. At former meetings of the Congress the Commission's Report had not been considered by the Section prior to its being approved by the Commission, and, even when it had been so approved, no copies had been provided for the Section who had had to rely upon listening to the Report being read aloud by the Secretary to the Commission. That procedure made it difficult to obtain a proper understanding of the terms of the Report, particularly for those members of the Section whose mother tongue was some language other than English. The Commission felt sure that the Section would welcome the innovation constituted by the presentation of the Report, while still in the draft stage, and the circulation of typed copies. The President proposed that the Section should adjourn for a short time to enable

members to examine the draft of the Report proposed to be submitted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

THE SECTION accordingly adjourned for the purpose suggested by the President.

(On resumption)

THE SECTION examined paragraph by paragraph the draft of the Report prepared for submission by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for submission to the Congress (Paper I.C.(48)20). In the course of the discussion the following points were made :—

- (1) *Paragraph 17*: In view of the statement just made to the Section regarding the change in the Danish representation on the Commission, a drafting change would need to be made in this paragraph. It was explained that this paragraph had been prepared before the change referred to had become known.
- (2) *Paragraph 19*: It was pointed out that a corresponding change in this paragraph was required. It would be necessary also to recast this paragraph, in order to explain the system for securing the periodical renewal of the membership of the Commission which the Section had agreed to substitute for the system of nine-year Classes, which had outworn its usefulness when the Congress ceased to meet regularly at three-yearly intervals.
- (3) *Paragraphs 32-35*: The view was expressed that the situation disclosed by these paragraphs was very disturbing. The grant made to the Commission by UNESCO was of great value, but it was evident that none the less the continued existence of the Commission as an effective working organisation depended exclusively upon the efforts of the spare-time honorary Secretary. This was clearly most unsatisfactory, for it was quite wrong that an essential piece of international machinery should rest upon so precarious a foundation. Every possible effort should be made to secure a satisfactory financial basis for the Commission.
- (4) *Paragraphs 44 and 45*: It was suggested that these two paragraphs, of which the first was concerned with the "Official List" for generic names and the second with the corresponding List for the names of species, should be drafted in similar terms, paragraph 45 being redrafted on the lines of paragraph 44.

It was desirable to indicate the types of names proposed to be placed on the new "Official List" and also to emphasise that the names standardised in that "Official List" were specific trivial names and that, while it was essential to cite in connection with each of the trivial names concerned the generic name in combination with which it had originally been published, the fact that the specific trivial name was standardised by being placed on the "Official List" did not confer any status on the binominal combination in which that specific trivial name had originally been published or imply any view on the taxonomic question of the genus to which the species should be referred. This point might be made clear if the title given to this "Official List" referred not to "specific names" (i.e. to binominal combinations) but to "specific trivial names". It was generally agreed that it was desirable that this change should be made and also that the explanation of the scope of this "Official List" which had just been given should be recorded in the Commission's Report, together with a recommendation that a statement explaining the position in this regard should be prefixed to this "Official List" when it was published.

- (5) *Paragraph 47*: It was suggested that it was worth giving further consideration to the proposals set forth in the last two sentences of this paragraph. As there drafted, those sentences correctly reflected the decision already taken by the Section, but it should be realised that the responsibility for checking the draft of the revised *Règles*, when prepared by the jurists, was a heavy one, demanding not only the greatest care but also a thorough knowledge of the decisions taken by the present Congress and of the discussions leading up to those decisions. In the special circumstances created by the absence from the present Congress of two of the members of the Executive Committee, it was for consideration whether it would not be better to entrust this duty to an *ad hoc* Editorial Committee composed of members (including, if desired, Alternate Members) of the Commission who had been present at the Paris Congress and had taken an active part in the discussions of the Commission and the Section. The President recalled that this was the Proposal which, as Secretary to the Commission, he had himself submitted to the Commission (Paper

I.C.(48)6, paragraph 26(iii)). This proposal, which followed the precedent set by the Berlin Congress of 1901 when the present *Règles* were approved, had the advantage that it ensured that the personnel of the Editorial Committee was fully acquainted with all the details of the Paris discussions; it had the further advantage that it did not throw, as did the existing proposal, an undue burden upon those members of the Executive Committee who had not been present at the Paris Congress. For these reasons he (the President) welcomed the amendment of this paragraph of the Report which had been suggested from the floor of the Section.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that it was clear from the discussion which had taken place that the Commission were in general agreement with the draft Report which had been submitted to them (Paper I.C.(48)20) and also that there was general agreement in the Section on that Report, subject to the modifications and corrections which had been suggested. In order to make progress with this matter, it was necessary now that the Commission itself should formally adopt the Report as a preliminary to its being put by him to the Section for approval. He accordingly proposed that the Section should adjourn for a short time to enable the Commission to consider the draft Report in the light of the discussion.

THE SECTION accordingly agreed to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider the draft of their Report to the Congress in the light of the suggestions made in the discussion which had just taken place.

(On resumption)

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) announced that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had unanimously adopted as their Report to the Congress the draft attached to Paper I.C.(48)20, subject to the incorporation therein of the corrections in paragraphs 17 and 19 rendered necessary by the proposed change in the Danish representation on the Commission and by the introduction of a new system in place of the three nine-year Classes into which the Commission was at present divided, and to the redrafting of paragraph 45 in accordance with the suggestions made in the course of the discussion in the Section. In the case also of paragraph 47, the Commission were in agreement with the views expressed in the Section and had agreed to modify that paragraph in the sense suggested. The Commission proposed to consider later in

the day the exact terms to be adopted for this paragraph, if that course were agreeable to the Section. He (the President) therefore now submitted the Report of the Commission to the Section for approval. In doing so he had to recall that, as he had explained earlier during the present meeting, there still remained a considerable number of proposals for the amendment of the *Règles* to be considered, first by the Commission and, second, by the Section. In the form in which the Report was drafted, it would cover those proposals if later in the day the Commission and the Section were to agree upon them. No change would therefore need to be made on account of these proposals. It would be necessary however for the Section to secure that the approval of the minor amendments to the *Règles* referred to in the Commission's Report signified by them (the Section) when approving the Commission's Report extended not only to such of those amendments as had already been approved (i.e. all those amendments approved by the Section up to the end of their meeting held on the previous Saturday) but also to such similar amendments as might be approved by the Section in the course of the present day. The Section had had a most instructive and valuable discussion on the Commission's Report, and it would, he (the President) believed, be to the general advantage if the Section were now to terminate that discussion and pass to the other important questions awaiting their consideration. He accordingly proposed that the Section should now take a decision on the Report submitted by the Commission with the amendments therein agreed upon by the Commission in the light of the discussion which had taken place. In order to make provision for the cases which still remained to be submitted to the Section, he proposed, as President of the Section, to put to the Section on each occasion the question whether the approval given by them to the Report by the Commission extended also to the further proposals then submitted.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session:
2nd Meeting.)

Continuing, the President said that, in accordance with precedent, the Commission asked the Section first to give their specific approval for each and all of the individual recommendations set forth in their Report and, second, to approve the Report as a whole and to agree to its being submitted on their behalf to the Congress with an indication that it had been approved and adopted by the Section. This proposal was made on the understanding that if, as the result of the discussion of further items either during the present meeting or during the meetings to be held later that day, the Commission and the Section agreed to make any additions to the Report, he should be authorised to insert

therein the additions so agreed upon before the Report was submitted to the Congress.

MR. C. F. DOS PASSOS (U.S.A.) said that he had much pleasure in moving the adoption of the Commission's Report in the terms indicated by the President.

MR. R. WINCKWORTH (UNITED KINGDOM) then seconded the motion proposed by Mr. Dos Passos.

After an opportunity had been given for any member of the Section, who might so desire, to move an amendment to the foregoing motion and no such amendment had been proposed, THE PRESIDENT put the motion to the Section by whom it was unanimously adopted.

THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, in accordance with the request so made to him by the Section, he would present the Commission's Report to the Congress at the *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following day and, in doing so, would inform the Congress that the Report had been unanimously adopted by the Section.

6. PROFESSOR J. CHESTER BRADLEY (U.S.A.) said that, following upon the discussion of the Commission's Report, he wished to bring to the special attention of the Section—and through the Section, that of the Congress as a whole—the extremely dangerous situation created by the fact that in existing conditions the entire existence of the Commission depended upon its securing for the Office of Secretary a zoologist who not only possessed exceptional vigour and knowledge of nomenclature but who was able also to devote long hours to the work of the Commission. The Commission were fortunate in having in Mr. Hemming an honorary Secretary who possessed these qualifications, but, with the growing volume of the work of the Commission, it was becoming more and more difficult for Mr. Hemming to discharge all the duties which fell to his lot. Moreover, it was not reasonable to expect any honorary officer whose primary occupation lay in an entirely different field to devote almost the whole of his spare time to the work of the Commission. For the present, this was inevitable, but the position would remain extremely dangerous until the future existence of the Commission could be assured by securing for it funds both sufficiently large and sufficiently secure to enable the Commission to engage a whole-time salaried official, himself a zoologist of high standing, to whom could be delegated a large part of the numerous duties which now fell to the honorary Secretary to the Commission. Unfortunately, the Congress was not itself in a position to

Proposal that the
"Comité
Permanent"
be asked to
propose to the
Congress a
Resolution to be
sent to UNESCO
stressing the
extreme importance
of the work of
the International
Commission on
Zoological
Nomenclature

do much to help in this matter but there was one thing which it could do and which he hoped that it would do. This was to adopt a Resolution at its final *Concilium Plenum* for transmission to UNESCO expressing the thanks of the Congress for the financial assistance now being given, stressing the fundamental importance of the work of the Commission and urging the continuance of financial support on the highest scale that could be provided. He accordingly proposed that the *Comité Permanent* of the Congress should be invited to bring forward a Resolution in this sense at the concluding *Concilium Plenum* to be held on the following morning.

With the permission of the President, he (Professor J. Chester Bradley) would himself put this proposal to the Section, by whom, he felt confident, it would be adopted by acclamation.

On the motion being so put, THE SECTION adopted by acclamation the proposal brought forward by Professor J. Chester Bradley.

Fourth instalment of miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles" (Paper I.C. (48) 16) : procedure proposed in regard to

7. THE PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the next matter to be considered was the group of proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* in various respects submitted in Commission Paper I.C. (48)16. Copies of this paper had been distributed earlier in the meeting at the same time as copies of the Commission's draft Report. Seventeen proposals were put forward in this paper, which contained the fourth instalment of such proposals submitted at the present Session. These proposals had for convenience of discussion been given serial numbers consecutive with those submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15 and earlier papers. The present proposals were accordingly numbered (64) to (80). These proposals would need to be considered by the Commission before they were submitted to the Section, but, as the present meeting was not only a meeting of the Commission but also a meeting of the Section, he proposed that the Commission should be asked to consider these proposals in the presence of the Section and that, immediately upon the close of the discussion of these proposals by the Commission, the Commission's recommendations thereon should be reported to the Section for approval. This procedure had the double advantage both that it saved time, a consideration of great importance in the present stage of the labours of the Section, and also that it provided every member of the Section with an opportunity of being present at the dis-